11-2023

Edward C. Hegeler and the Open Court Publishing Company

John Haller Jr.
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

EDWARD C. HEGELER AND THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY

John s. Haller, Jr.

The known is finite, the unknown is infinite; intellectually we stand on an islet in the midst of an illimitable ocean of inexplicability. Our business in every generation is to reclaim a little more land; to add something to the extent and solidity of our possessions.

Thomas Henry Huxley. *On the Reception of the Origin of Species,* 1887

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

This book would not have been possible without the courtesies extended by the staff of Morris Library's Special Collections at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale which houses the Open Court Publishing Company's Papers. In particular, my thanks go to archivist and philosophy faculty member Nicholas L. Guardiano who assisted me in discovering the many hats that Edward C. Hegeler wore during his lifetime. Others in the Special Collections division of the library to whom I am grateful are Tony Bittle, Aaron M. Lisec, Anne Marie Hamilton-Brehm, Matt Gorzalski, and Walter D. Ray. This excellent team provided me with full access to the files of the Open Court Publishing Company founded in 1887 by Edward Hegeler, with Dr. Paul Carus serving as editor, manager, and author until his death in 1919. Also helpful in supporting this project were the members of the Hegeler Carus Foundation which included Executive Director Cindy Waddick, Site Manager Dan Irvin, Caretaker Kristin Irvin, Tour director Tricia Kelly, and Administrative Assistant April Murphy. I am also appreciative to JSTOR, ProQuest, WorldCat, Google Books, and the Hathi Trust for their facilitation of books, articles, and other essential materials. Lastly, I express my deepest thanks to Robin, my wife of fifty-plus years, for her unstinting support of my work. Without her encouragement, criticism, suggestions, and editing, none of what I have accomplished in my career would have been possible.

Introduction

Not until forty years into my academic career did I begin examining the papers of the Open Court Publishing Company housed in the Special Collections section of Morris Library at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. Despite my lateness, access to its contents gave me insight into material for several books that I subsequently wrote, including *Distant Voices: Sketches of a Swedenborgian Worldview* (2017), *Modern Spiritualism: Its Quest to Become a Science* (2020), *Fictions of Certitude: Science, Faith, and the Search for Meaning, 1840-1920* (2020), and *The Buddha's Midwife: Paul Carus and the Spread of Buddhism in America* (2022). In reading through the correspondence and other documentation of the Hegeler/Carus family of La Salle, Illinois, I found the significant presence of Edward C. Hegeler who, besides being co-founder of the Matthiessen and Hegeler Zinc Works (hereafter M&H ZINC), also founded the Open Court Publishing Company (hereafter Open Court) which produced two magazines, one a highly regarded monthly (*The Open Court*), the other, a world-class quarterly (*The Monist*). In addition, the company published hundreds of books, including original works, reprints, and compilations of serialized work from its two magazines. While many referred to *The Open Court* and *The Monist* as journals, Hegeler and Carus preferred to use the word magazine.[1]

Beyond the dozen or so articles and editorials Hegeler wrote to advance the philosophy of monism, immortality, and the science of religion, he lived in the shadow of his son-in-law, Paul Carus, who he initially hired to tutor his children and work as an associate editor to *The Open Court*. Because the magazine's editor, Benjamin F. Underwood, refused to accept Carus in the latter position, Hegeler employed him as his personal secretary to represent his views as publisher in the pages of

The Open Court. By year's end, however, Hegeler replaced Underwood with Carus who would soon become his son-in-law. Through the remainder of his life, Hegeler worked as associate editor and advisor to both *The Open Court* and *The Monist,* contributing articles, comments, notes, and book reviews for the two magazines. In addition, as publisher, he controlled the purse strings of the Open Court; paying for office space in Chicago as well as for typesetting and printing equipment, the purchases of paper and other supplies; hiring agents in London, Paris, Leipzig, Singapore, Tokyo, and New York; providing wages to staff; paying for storage costs; and approving stipends for authors.

The intent of this book is not to dwell on Hegeler's role as a businessman who, with his partner Frederick Matthiessen, built M&H ZINC and affiliated companies, or in the grooming of his daughter Mary who assumed his management responsibilities with those same companies. Instead, my purpose is to examine his role as founder of the Open Court, his vision of what the publishing company and its two magazines should be, and the degree to which he influenced the thinking of Carus on the core purposes of those publications. Hegeler wore many hats during his lifetime, but the emphasis here will be on his vision which Carus implemented. With Carus as the company's prolific author and editor, and *The Open Court* and *The Monist* as the instruments, Hegeler built bridges across continents, connecting great minds like the physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach; philosopher and mathematician Charles S. Peirce; sociologist Lester Ward; physiologist Karl Ewald Hering; evolutionary biologist and physiologist George J. Romanes; philosopher and psychologist John Dewey; geneticist Hugo De Vries; and philologist and Orientalist Frederich Max Müller. Until his death in 1910, Hegeler's influence, like *l'éminence grise* ("the grey eminence"), was that of a confidential advisor and decision-maker who created and sustained a family company unique in the publishing world.[2]

Chapter 1

A Determined Man

On September 13, 1835, Edward Carl Hegeler, one of eight siblings of Hermann Dietrich and Anna Katerina (von Tungeln), was born in Bremen, an ancient city that for a time was a free state in the Hanseatic League and famous for its religious and political strife.[1] Early in Edward's life, his father, a wealthy tobacco importer, who had once spent several years in New York working in the diplomatic service as Bremen City State Consul, made known to the family that he wished for Edward, his youngest son, to make his home in America instead of remaining on the continent. As a consequence of that decision, Herman Hegeler planned out Edward's education in considerable detail, including schooling at Schnepfenthal Institute, a private boarding academy in Gotha, on the northern slopes of the Thüringer Wald. Its founder, the talented linguist and theologian Christian Gotthilf Salamann, directed his nine teachers to instruct their students in a gymnasium-style education that combined the classics with physical exercise and a liberal approach to Lutheranism. Exemplary of the school's intellectual rigor, Edward's report card listed his subjects as religion, German, French, English, geography, history, mathematics, physics, natural history, technology, and chemistry. During his time there, he was also confirmed in the Evangelical Lutheran Church.[2]

As a member of the Reformed Church, Edward inherited a religious temperament strongly influenced by the pietistic movement that swept across German-speaking Europe, Scandinavia, and the Baltics in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries teaching individual piety and personal regeneration rather than strict reliance on dogma. Edward was

deeply affected by the hymns he learned at the academy which were devotional in character, more of the heart than the head, and focused on life in general rather than biblical content or intent. When he eventually immigrated to the United States, he found all the requisites for enjoying his pietistic heritage which gravitated toward introspection, holiness, and warmhearted spirituality.

Tall, blue-eyed, and hardy at age sixteen, Edward entered the Polytechnic Institute in Hanover (1851-1853) where he studied elementary, higher, and applied mathematics, natural history, mineralogy, chemistry, and manual drafting. From there, he transferred to the School of Mines (Königliche Bergakademie) at Freiberg in Saxony (1853-1856) where he took up the study of mining engineering science from professors August Breithaupt and Friedrich Mohls, and mathematics, mining engineering, mineralogy, crystallography, and mine surveying from Julius Ludwig Weisbach.[3] While attending the school, Hegeler became engaged to Dr. Weisbach's daughter, Camilla (1835-1908) with the understanding that they would delay marriage until he could start a successful business in America. Edward also became friends with Frederick William Matthiessen (1835-1918) from the province of Schleswig-Holstein, then part of Denmark. Although many individuals, and even entire families, were fleeing Germany for political reasons, this was not the case for either Hegeler or Matthiessen who shared similar economic backgrounds, values, and goals. Irrespective of the prevailing political climate, they planned to settle in the United States where they agreed to pool their resources in a joint business venture. "He had already made up his mind to come to America and I had been here before," recalled Matthiessen. "It was thus natural that we formed an early acquaintance, which afterward ripened into friendship."[4]

In 1855, when faced with the prognosis of painful and incurable rectal cancer, Edward's father took his own life, drowning in the Weser River. Since Edward was not yet twenty years of age, and having inherited assets of approximately 80,000 Bremer thalers, plus a share in the family business, he was required by law to accept the guardianship of his father's brother, Heinrich, and his brother-in-law Johann Hermann Holler. Edward

accepted their wise counsel until he was of age to assume responsibility for his inheritance and to fulfill his father's wish for him to immigrate.[5]

Following their graduation from the School of Mines in 1856, Matthiessen and Hegeler visited mining districts in Germany, Belgium, and Great Britain to better understand the current technological and financial aspects of the business. In the spring of 1857, they immigrated according to plan, and after arriving in Boston, they moved to New York where they sought information regarding potential sites for zinc manufacturing since, at the time, nearly all zinc products were imported from Europe. While there, they learned of a failing company in Friedensville, Pennsylvania, the site of the Pennsylvania and Lehigh Zinc Company, owned by three German metallurgists who, despite the ore being of good quality, had been unable to smelt the metal.

Tenacious in their convictions, Hegeler and Matthiessen, who were only 22 years old, rented the plant and succeeded in designing a smelting process that produced spelter, a zinc-lead alloy. However, because of the owners' unwillingness to invest in the enterprise, and concerns regarding the sustainability of the mines in the region to produce sufficient amounts of coal needed for the smelting process, the two entrepreneurs decided to explore other sites that could offer greater promise.[6] As Matthiessen explained:

> We heard about the discovery of zinc ore in the West and concluded to ascertain what chances there might be out west. We had learned of the existence of zinc ore in southeastern Missouri and in Wisconsin. On our way west we stopped for a few months at Pittsburg, which was the great manufacturing center, believing that by so doing, we might get acquainted with American necessities and American business methods. Then we went and explored the mines in southeastern Missouri. We made investigations with a view of establishing, perhaps, a smelter in the coal region of East St. Louis. Our experiments with the ore were satisfactory, but we found difficulties in our way on account of political conditions. We could do nothing there.[7]

After examining sites along the Ohio River near Pittsburgh, and another near Johnstown, Pennsylvania, and a final site in the Joplin region of southeastern Missouri, the two young engineers decided in the spring of 1858 to take their smelter process to the newly incorporated prairie town of La Salle, Illinois, at the junction of the Illinois and Michigan Canal and the Illinois River. They based their choice on La Salle's proximity by rail and water to coal and low- grade sphalerite ore available in Mineral Point, Wisconsin, whose miners were harvesting lead, not zinc, which they threw aside as worthless. Working with Alexander Campbell, La Salle's first mayor, they purchased land on the banks of the Little Vermilion River near the tracks of the Illinois Central Railroad at the eastern edge of the town and broke ground on Christmas Eve of 1858 for their first furnace. The clay for the Hegeler Retort Furnace was purchased in St. Louis and shipped by boat to La Salle.[8]

Although Matthiessen and Hegeler started on an experimental scale, they faced disappointing results in their first year of operation—so much so that they named the plant "Perseverance." When the Civil War broke out in 1861, they closed the plant temporarily because the market in zinc had collapsed, and used the time to make improvements in the production process. Within a year, the market returned, and building on the changes they had made to the smelting process, succeeded in fulfilling the demand for their products, including the manufacture of sufficient zinc for rifle and pistol cartridges. Throughout the company's early years, the partners spent seven days per week at their jobs, had beds moved into their offices, and took turns spending the night at the plant. When the smelting process went exceptionally well, which was not often, they could produce as much as 7,000 pounds in a day.[9]

Due primarily to their physical location, diligence, and technical expertise, as well as their partnership with the Illinois Central Railroad, and later the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad, what began as a zinc smelting operation grew by 1866 to include the nation's first rolling mill which formed the metal into sheets of flexible zinc. In 1871, M&H ZINC incorporated, selling its stock publicly to enable them to fund further improvements and expansions. As explained by economic historian Oliver Zunc, "Incorporation offered a more flexible

legal structure for bringing in of capital and also more security against personal liability." With the change, the partners agreed that Hegeler become president and Matthiessen assume the title of secretary of the company.[10]

Because of the enormous energy requirements to produce zinc, the company started mining coal on its own property in 1874, advertising for miners from Silesia, Ireland, Wales, Austria, and Germany. Three separate shafts were dug to capture the coal: the first about 100 feet below the surface; a second some 80 further down; and a third almost 400 feet below the surface.[11] A year later, the company was operating its own rail line, the La Salle and Bureau County Railroad and linking its products to the Illinois Central and the Chicago, Peoria, and Quincy rail lines. To Mayor Campbell's credit, he was able to centralize the commercial, banking, coal, transportation, and manufacturing interests in the downtown business district of La Salle. By 1877, the company's physical plant had spread over eighty acres, and by 1881, M&H ZINC had four furnaces operating with an expanded product line that included sulfuric and nitric acid, both by-products of the smelting process. To manufacture sulfuric acid required a chimney that rose 256 feet high above the plant. The expansion in the product line led to affiliated companies that included the Zinc Roofing and Ornamenting Company, Matthiessen and Hegeler Zinc of Missouri, Meadowbrook Corporation, and Sherbrooke Metallurgical Company of Canada. By 1900, M&H ZINC employed 300 workers, a number that grew to more than 900 by 1910. Over time, and with continual improvements in the process, M&H ZINC became the largest producer of zinc and zinc products in the country. Besides Hegeler's notable recognition as the inventor of the zinc smelting furnace (Hegeler Retort Furnace) in 1872, his muffle roasting furnace known as the Hegeler Kiln, which he patented in 1884, was used in virtually every zinc plant worldwide.[12]

Private Life

By the early 1870s, both men were wealthy and looking for opportunities to invest their money and time in new pursuits. Matthiessen went on to establish the Western Clock Manufacturing Company and the

La Salle Tool Company which would later merge to become Westclox. He also served as La Salle's mayor from 1886 to 1895, president of the La Salle-Peru High School Board, and established the Hygienic Institute in La Salle to address issues of public health. Among his many philanthropic contributions was the development of Deer Park near La Salle which the family gifted to the state in 1944 and is now known as Matthiessen State Park Nature Area.[13]

During Hegeler's long engagement to Camilla Weisbach, he sent her several letters explaining his views on marriage, his expectations of a wife, and how their children would be brought up. Camilla, in return, let him know that she had a mind of her own and, in some instances, a far different opinion on the matters he wrote about. Despite their differences, and against the wishes of her parents who wanted their son-in-law to live closer to Freiberg, Hegeler married Camilla on April 5, 1860. On returning to Illinois, they settled in La Salle where they had ten children, three of whom died during their lifetime. Two, Helene Emma (1862-1868) and Meta Rosalie (1865-1868) died within nine days of each other, while Gisela Cazela (1869-1892) died in the bloom of her youth from tuberculosis, otherwise known as the 'White Plague.'[14] The other seven included Marie Henriette Hegeler (1861-1936) who married Paul Carus on March 28, 1888, and took over management of M&H ZINC and affiliated companies, including a railroad and the Open Court Publishing Company, from her father; Camilla Hegeler (1863-1955) who married physicist Alfred Bucherer; Julius Weisbach Hegeler (1867-1943) who married Josephine Caesar; Annie Hegeler (1873-1951) who married Dr. Rufus Cole, director of the Hospital of the Rockefeller Institute in New York; Herman Hegeler (1872-1913) who died unmarried; Lena Zuleikha Hegeler (1875-1962) who married Baron Karl von Vietinghoff; and Olga Hegeler (1879-1956), who married a Danish chemist, industrialist, and art collector Christian Bai Lihme. Of the five sisters, two moved to Germany. Both Julius and Herman became mining engineers and worked in the La Salle plant before establishing their own zinc manufacturing business in Dansville, Illinois. The sons' relationship with their father remained tenuous even in the best of times, a situation aggravated by their older sister's controlling presence in M&H ZINC.

Hegeler Residence

Early in their marriage, Edward and Camilla lived at Buckin and Fourth in La Salle, and then Union and Eighth, before moving to 1307 Seventh Street where Chicago architect William W. Boyington, best known for his design of the original campus of the University of Chicago, the Chicago Water Tower, and later the state capitol building in Springfield, designed a Second Empire style home with a mansard roof and cupola, a wraparound veranda, a large formal dining room, two libraries, a grand staircase, nine bedrooms, four bathrooms, and a school room. Its brick and limestone exterior was hidden behind a façade of cement parging which gave the appearance of stone blocks, while its interior, the work of German-American August Fiedler, was designed in Old World beauty with parquet floors, hand-painted ceilings in its more formal rooms, and specially built furniture, carvings, inlaid wood panels, and cabinetry. A steam tunnel, connecting the factory to the house, provided heat and boiled water for the laundry. There were zinc-lined cabinets and closets, zinc gutters and rainspouts, and a zinc-lined water tank that fed sinks in the bedrooms. The plumbing system, including four bathrooms (build from closet space), was added about 1892, and electricity around 1900. There were many other modern elements to the house, including a gymnasium, billiard room, and ten-pin alley.

The 57-room, seven-level, 16,000 square foot residence included a sub-basement that connected to a narrow tunnel for bringing steam heat from the factory; a basement containing a large gymnasium, wine cellar, and laundry; a ground or first floor that held the offices of the Open Court; a second floor with rooms that included a reception area, salon, dining room, children's room, family room, kitchen, and library; the third floor that contained eight family and two guest bedrooms; a fourth floor which was unfinished; and an attic.

The residence, which stood on a three-acre hilltop site directly above the M&H ZINC, looked "like a baronial castle on a bluff above the rooftops of La Salle, an object of awe to the Illinois River steamboat men of the 1870s and 1880s." The home symbolized the town's newly acquired prominence as a transportation hub for the Illinois Central,

Rock Island, La Salle and Bureau County, and the Chicago Quincy and Burlington railroads whose trunk lines connected the continent. Completed in 1876, the residence cost over $750,000, or the equivalent of approximately $23.3 million today.[15]

When the Hegeler family lived at the mansion, there was no live-in staff. Instead, their needs were met by a complement of household and outdoor employees numbering between fifteen and twenty. Only after Paul and Mary Carus moved into the residence in 1889 did the family employ a live-in nanny.

The period of time when the Hegeler residence was at its most developed state was between 1915 to 1919.[16]

> In its heyday the Hegeler abode was one of the show places of the Illinois River Valley. The house stood in the center of an estate occupying an entire city block. Fine shade trees spread their branches over well-kept lawns. Bubbling fountains, flower gardens, paths, and driveways added to the attractiveness of the place. From their small balcony porches or bay windows, the Hegelers could see the broad, rolling surface of the Illinois River.[17]

Guests at the Hegeler residence included the geologist and explorer John Wesley Powell whose family came from the La Salle-Peru region, the Chicago lawyer Charles C. Bonney who served as President of the World's Congresses at the Columbian Exposition in 1893, the Scottish-American philosopher, scientist, and physician Edmund Montgomery and his wife Elizabeth Ney; mathematician Charles Sanders Peirce; the German American Gustav Körner who had been a friend of Lincoln and in 1872 became a supporter of the Liberal Republican Party and ran unsuccessfully for governor; and several Hindu and Buddhist delegates who had attended the Parliament of Religions, among others.[18]

Turning Inward

In the aftermath of the Civil War, Hegeler witnessed the loss of the nation's moral compass in what became known as the "Gilded

Age." The term derived from Mark Twain and Charles Dudley Warner's *The Gilded Age: A Tale of Today* (1873), a novel that celebrated a "golden age" of prosperity whose "captains of industry" and "robber barons," among whom were John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Leland Stanford, and J. P. Morgan, utilized broad interpretations of the law and the lack of statutory prohibitions to grow rich. The only thing concealing their greed was the garish display of hyperbole behind the superficial glamour and opulent richness displayed in their homes and in the clothes and jewelry of their wives and mistresses. It was an age of laissez-faire and of a benevolent God whose clergy gave sanction to the concentration of wealth and power at the expense of the greater whole.

The era was also a time of serious introspection in matters of faith and reason. The confrontation between religion and science had been in the making since scholars in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Tübingen began examining the historical records to confirm or deny the biblical events as described in the Old and New Testaments. Among the university's more well-known scholars were Friedrich Schleiermacher, David Friedrich Strauss, and Ludwig Feuerbach. Recognized for their "Higher Criticism," they utilized historical context and rigorous scholarship to challenge Christianity's flawed credibility in its dogmatic assertion that the Bible was literally true and divinely inspired. No longer able to square the unfolding of new discoveries with the broken pieces of Christian dogma, many of their followers turned their efforts into an ethical undertaking to discover a substitute set of standards applicable for the emerging secular world.[19]

Accompanying this challenge was the impact of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by means of natural selection which placed the issue of science and religion squarely in the hands of educated men and women across the religious and scientific spectrum as they confronted the stark effects of dysteleology implicit in the randomness of a chance universe. Faced with its unknown consequences versus unquestioned belief in God and immortality, society seemed more comfortable with those who gave evolution a cosmic or spiritual motif than those avowed

atheists like Ernst Haeckel and Carl Vogt who approached the topic as materialists and radical freethinkers. This included Henry Huxley ("Darwin's bulldog"), who spoke glowingly of Darwin's theory but deliberately avoided discussing its particulars. Instead, he identified himself as an agnostic on those matters that reason and experience could not prove. Another was Alfred Wallace who, unsatisfied with the scientist's emphasis on the "how," chose to ask the philosopher's "why," a choice that gave him entrée into the world of Spiritualism and the coherence he found in the existence of spirits who communicated with the living. There were also Benjamin Kidd and Arabella Buckley who gave evolution a spiritualist and non-Christian overtone; Lyman Abbott and Henry Ward Beecher for whom evolution equated to God's method of creation; and Asa Gray, Henry Drummond, and John Fiske who transformed evolution into theism. [20]

An educated and discerning individual, Hegeler stayed abreast of the emerging political, philosophical, and religious issues of the day, hoping to find a greater purpose for himself in the country he had adopted. In his first venture at finding a purpose, he joined the Liberal Republican Party movement, a dissident offshoot of the Republican Party, which sought to address the scandals that had rocked the nation soon after Ulysses S. Grant's inauguration as president on March 4, 1869. Feeling his need for engagement, Hegeler announced his candidacy in 1872 for the Illinois State Senate on the reform ticket. At the party's national convention in Cincinnati, its delegates nominated Horace Greeley for President and Missouri Governor Benjamin Gratz Brown for Vice President. Hegeler, who stood against Elmer Baldwin, lost by 938 votes. Disappointed but not otherwise depressed, he looked around for other options that would give him a purpose in life.

In anticipation of devoting his time to other pursuits, Hegeler prepared his oldest daughter to assume a greater role in the M&H ZINC and its complementary industries. Mary (Marie) Henriette Herminie Hegeler attended school in La Salle, and at age sixteen, worked in the company's assaying office measuring the purity of the zinc. After graduating from high school in 1878 she enrolled at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, majoring in mathematics and chemistry.

Following her graduation in 1882, the first woman to earn a B.S. from Michigan's College of Engineering, she attended lectures on metallurgy at the Mining Academy in Freiberg. While there, she lived in her father's former home and worked in the laboratory of her uncle, the famous chemist Clemens Winkler, the discoverer of the element Germanium (Ge) in 1886. Despite her outstanding grades, the Academy was prohibited from awarding her a degree on account of her sex.[21]

After completing her courses, Mary took the "Grand Tour" before returning home in 1887 and assuming the responsibilities that belonged to her father, including the position of Director. As explained by Kate B. Carus, "The trust that Edward Hegeler had in his young daughter's technical and managerial abilities helped give him the freedom to pursue his inventions while assured that he had adequate oversight on everyday plant operations."[22] In 1903, she was elected president, serving from 1903 to 1914, 1916 to 1918, and 1933 to 1936. She was also made vice president of the Carus Chemical Works, and president of the La Salle and Bureau County Railroad. By 1910, she was managing over 900 employees and making decisions at multiple levels of the corporation. In 1925, after a fierce series of court battles that began when the Matthiessen family claimed the presidency of M&H ZINC in 1913, Mary was able to purchase the Matthiessen's half interest in the corporation, giving the Hegeler family full control. During the Great Depression, to offset a 40% wage reduction and other curtailments in the workforce necessary to compensate for the drastic decline in demand for the company's product, she turned over hundreds of shares of zinc company stock to the employees to offset their loss of wages.[23]

With Mary now taking her father's place at M&H ZINC, Hegeler used the opportunity to become involved in a variety of pursuits. Besides his sojourn into politics, he contributed to philanthropic causes and joined societies dedicated to finding answers outside the strident formalism associated with the established churches as none seemed able to free themselves from the dogmatic formulations of the past. For too long, faith had been separated from reason, and despite the impact of the Higher Criticism and evolutionary theory, the status quo seemed to be a permanent fixture among the multitude of denominations created in the

aftermath of the Reformation. However, in keeping with French eclectic philosopher Victor Cousin's assertion that all the world's philosophies and religions carried elements of truth, Hegeler thought it possible to select what was good and true from each and organize them into a single meaningful structure. This meant replacing dogmatic beliefs with truths built on science—beliefs that would protect and expand religion's ethical contributions to humankind—thus saving those aspects of religion that still served a meaningful purpose.

In his search for a new worldview, Hegeler believed he had a responsibility to use his wealth for only the worthiest projects. One such endeavor was to purify religion of its impediments. This meant looking at where the findings of science and the teachings of religion intersected and to ascertain if there were ways to re-conceptualize religion from a scientific point of view. For too long, religion had drawn believers away from the reductionist basis upon which the sciences were founded, namely, the idea of reducing complex interactions to the sum of their constituent parts. In his mind, the solution involved accepting monism, a metaphysical and theological concept that denied the Cartesian duality of matter and mind, and advocating instead that all existence derived from one unified set of laws that underlay the entirety of the universe. In place of concepts that accounted for body and soul, matter and spirit, object and subject, and matter and force, monism merged all such distinctions into a higher unity. "Mr. Hegeler's religion was simple enough," explained his son-in-law Paul Carus, "but like many simple things it was not easy for everyone to understand."

His ancestors had belonged to the Reformed Church, and the intellectual atmosphere of his father's house which surrounded him in his childhood was liberal. In Schnepfenthal he came in contact with the pietistic traditions of that institution, and he was deeply impressed with its devotional spirit, especially as it found utterance in song. When further experience in life broadened him, he surrendered his belief in Christian dogmatism but preserved its seriousness of purpose, moral endeavor, and profound faithfulness in the monistic conception of

science. His idea of God had changed, but his "Religion of Science" would not dispense with God. [24]

* * *

With the practical side of philosophy running through Hegeler's veins, namely, the conciliation between science and religion, he found the need to advocate for those ideas, ideals, and deeds that were universally accepted as good, and which contributed to the growth (i.e., evolution) of the individual, the soul, and the race. To realize this objective required not only the application of scientific investigation to the problems of religion, leaving only the real truths remaining, but a system of ethics to bring everything into harmony. With this in mind, he conceived of starting a magazine around the subject of scientific religion that would draw thinkers from multiple faiths and cultures to lend freely their ideas and criticisms. "What leads me in this undertaking is not so much a sense of liberality, as a desire to communicate my ideas to others, to see them further developed, and also to have them contested." By strengthening them through opinions and criticisms from "the ablest men in the various departments of science," he thought it possible to contribute positively to the shaping of fact-proven truths.[25]

Chapter 2

Bargaining for Position

In Hegeler's search to redress the formalism of established pre-and-post-Reformation belief systems, he lent his support intellectually and financially to associations like the Society for Ethical Culture founded in 1882 (six years after the Ethical Culture movement was launched in New York by Felix Adler), and the Free Religious Association, a free thought society formed in 1867 by David Atwood Wasson, Lucretia Mott, and William J. Potter. Its audience, among whom numbered Quakers, Jews, Unitarians, Universalists, Agnostics, Spiritualists, and Theists, opposed organized religion and advocated in its place the supremacy of individual conscience and reason. The Association's membership rolls listed many notable Americans, including Ralph Waldo Emerson, Charles Eliot Norton, Moncure Conway, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and Frederick Douglass. Its official organ, *The Index: A Weekly Paper Devoted to Free Religion,* was owned by Francis Ellingwood Abbot who served as its initial editor until 1873. During his time as editor, the paper relied heavily on donations to support its operating costs. Beginning in 1880, and lasting until December 30, 1886, when it published its final issue, *The Index* was located in Boston where the editorial work fell to Benjamin Franklin Underwood (1839-1914) and his wife Sara Underwood (1838-1911).

Benjamin F. Underwood

Born in 1839 in New York City, Benjamin Underwood received his education in the common schools and at Westerly Academy in Rhode Island. An enlistee in the 15th Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry in the

Civil War, he was wounded and captured at the Battle of Ball's Bluff on October 21, 1861, resulting in his imprisonment in Libby Prison until freed through an exchange of prisoners. He then re-enlisted in the 5th Rhode Island Heavy Artillery and served for the duration of the war. During the 1870s and 1880s, he earned the reputation of being a daunting polemicist on behalf of materialism (i.e., atheism) and anti-clericalism, and a ferocious debater willing to challenge any potential combatant, even the pro-Darwinian Asa Gray of Harvard who professed theism as his belief. As an outspoken freethinker, he authored numerous books and pamphlets on topics covering multiple subjects.[1]

On September 6, 1862, Underwood married Sara A. Francis, an English-born suffragist. Born in 1838 in Penrith, England, she moved with her family to Rhode Island as a child where she was raised on a diet of high Calvinism. Until she was twenty, she admitted to being a sincere believer, but eventually turned to Agnosticism. At no time did she ever feel she had reached any conclusion that was final except to state that her mind in regard to religious belief was more agnostic than anything else.[2]

In 1886, subscriptions for *The Index* fell short of its cost of publication, a situation that required its editor to raise money, a job that Underwood was disinclined to pursue with much vigor. Having known Edward Hegeler since about 1882, and appreciative of his past support for the magazine and for other liberal causes and organizations, he wrote to him seeking a contribution that would sustain the magazine's publication through the fiscal year. In his reply, Hegeler offered to support it under certain conditions and offered to meet Underwood in New York. In a person-to-person meeting held at Manhattan Beach on July 12, 1886, Hegeler explained his willingness to assume full publication costs for *The Index* provided the magazine moved to Chicago. Otherwise, he preferred to start his own magazine to advance the philosophy of Monism, and offered Underwood the opportunity to become its editor.[3]

In subsequent correspondence, it became clear that the Free Religious Association's trustees were reluctant to see *The Index* move

from Boston to New York, let alone to Chicago a prairie metropolis which stood as a monument to the gospel of greed. They found such a move equivalent to turning the magazine over to a high-pressure lobbyist with money to burn. Thus, if Hegeler was committed to starting a new publication, it had to be formed independent of *The Index,* or as its replacement provided that Underwood was associated with it, in which case *The Index* would cease and its subscribers' list turned over to the new magazine. If such an arrangement could be worked out, as Underwood explained to Hegeler, there would need to be an agreement that editorial authority, as well as the business management side of the paper, would be placed entirely in Underwood's hands. Of this, there could be no misunderstanding. Hegeler indicated his preference for an independent fortnightly or monthly magazine and offered to let Underwood and his wife move into his former home and publish from La Salle, or alternatively, live in Chicago where he could publish the paper.[4]

On September 9, Underwood informed Hegeler that the Association remained undecided on a course of action and therefore might choose to continue *The Index* for another year in Boston. If so, he would be obliged to remain in charge of the paper. Nevertheless, he assured Hegeler that he admired the fresh thinking of Westerners and felt he could enlarge his usefulness for liberal thought in Chicago if given the opportunity. He admitted to having joined *The Index* with "no experience as editor of a paper, and no knowledge of the business management of a paper." Because *The Index* supported a constituency "little advanced beyond the radical wing of Unitarianism," he admitted to adjusting its content so that the paper was "less scientific and less a representative of modern scientific thought than it would have been had the paper been exclusively under [his] control without any of the inherited characteristics, and quasi-theological surroundings." In that same letter to Hegeler, he indicated that he preferred to publish the magazine in Chicago to ensure its "metropolitan appearance and promise." He also wrote that his wife had been of great help on *The Index* and could supplement his own editorial work; they could begin as early as January 1887 provided the Association decided to cease publication of *The Index*.[5]

Hegeler agreed to arrange the necessary financial backing for the enterprise and asked what he and his wife were seeking as salary and noted once again his intent to have the paper represent "a philosophy in harmony with all facts (a Monistic philosophy) which will gradually become a new religion to it, as it has to [him.]" He then included in his letter an account of several discussions he had with a certain unnamed individual (M. C. O'Byrne) to make Underwood better acquainted with his monistic views.[6]

A week later, Underwood replied that he had read the discussions with great interest but "found it necessary to qualify or to supplement with additional thought before they seemed quite satisfactory to [him]." Although he agreed with Hegeler's optimistic and melioristic spirit along with his naturalistic and monistic view of the universe, he admitted to being "not always satisfied" with his terminology. He then promised to give Hegeler a more concise statement of his own creed and concluded by suggesting that Hegeler's thought, when "carefully revised," should be published "in essay form rather than as a discussion," assuring him that it would attract a readership. He provided Hegeler with an estimation of the cost of publishing a monthly magazine which he suggested should be called "The Index Magazine." He also proposed a weekly "The Index Flyer" to advertise forthcoming issues of the magazine. Finally, he recommended that the magazine carry the name of Edward Hegeler as the publisher, himself as editor and manager, and Mrs. Sara Underwood as associate editor.[7]

On October 8, Hegeler and Underwood reached an understanding to start a liberal publication in Chicago in early 1887, and that Underwood would be guaranteed a salary of $1,800, an amount which included a salary for his wife, who would serve as associate editor. The only matter not in the agreement was the name of the magazine which Hegeler insisted on calling "The Monist."[8]

On November 3, Underwood wrote Hegeler informing him that the trustees for the Association had agreed on the magazine's discontinuance. However, the magazine had left a small debt, and asked if Hegeler would cover the amount since it was but "a trifle." In return, they promised

him a complete list of their subscribers. Two weeks later, Underwood informed Hegeler that news of the "Chicago enterprise" had been widely discussed at the Free Religion Festival in Boston and that much of the conversation concerned its name, noting that several titles had been mentioned including "Horizon," "Dawn," "The Radical," "Reasoner," "The Reasoner and Critic," "the Sounding Lead," "The Meliorist," "The Tribunal," and "The Contemporary." However, the one they liked best was "The Open Court" which his wife Sara had suggested since it seemed to be not only dignified but easily recognizable. Hegeler thanked him for the information but insisted the magazine be published under the name "The Monist" and accompanied by a masthead that would read, "An open court for those religious ideas that affect the building up of religion on the basis of science."[9]

About a month later, Underwood informed Hegeler that the last issue of *The Index* included an announcement of the new magazine, *Unity.* Surprised that Underwood would choose the name without any prior agreement, Hegeler again reiterated his wish for the magazine to "be a mediator between the strictly Scientific and the progressively inclined world." He then reminded Underwood of his ideas on immortality about which the German novelist and playwright Gustav Freytag had been such an important influence and which also gave him a solid basis for ethics. What originally might have been called a philosophy was now a religion in a very practical sense of the word. To this end, he informed Underwood that he was open to a compromise on their differing views by suggesting the magazine be named "The Monist's Open Court" and making it a monthly at a price of three dollars per year. As Hegeler explained:

> The special feature must be to obtain the opinions and criticisms of the ablest men in the various departments of Science, on the opinions advanced by the magazine, as to what is established by Science, and also in regard to speculations that are presented by the magazine, if and then, how, they are in conflict with established facts. The character of the magazine must be such as to win the confidence of these specialists, and no effort or money be spared to secure their co-operation.[10]

Instead of accepting what Hegeler considered was a gracious compromise, Underwood again argued that "The Open Court" was the most suitable name, noting that the title had been "praised by those who have heard or read it." He next identified his objections to "Monist" and "Monism" insisting that the words were "unknown to the mass of readers" and therefore conveyed no special meaning. A liberal magazine should not be "pledged by its name to a particular speculative theory," but instead present and defend itself in subsequent articles and discussions in the magazine. Besides, those adherents to Monist beliefs like Haeckel, Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall, had expressed many different points of view. He then went on to criticize Hegeler's suggested masthead as giving readers the false impression that it was a religious magazine devoted to "a theological belief and a system of worship."[11]

Underwood did not stop there but reminded Hegeler that, with his appointment, he now had editorial and managerial control of the magazine. "Suggestions and advice are always welcomed by a reasonable man; but in conducting a magazine there must be, to secure excellence and success, the editorial authority to manage the magazine, according to the best editorial judgment." This meant that he, and he alone, should have "unhampered control" over all aspects of the publication. Implied in his remarks was a clear message that he should also have the last word on what the magazine should be named. "If, at the end of the year you shall be *dissatisfied* with my methods or *work,* it will be within your power and wholly your right to try some other man." Finally, Underwood recommended that, instead of a monthly, the magazine be a weekly, or a fortnightly.[12]

Whether conscious or not of what most observers would classify as a troubled if not doomed relationship, neither man seemed willing to walk away from their agreement. Instead, each wanted to have the last word. Hoping to use flattery to win Hegeler over, Underwood sent him quotes from a letter he had received from someone who claimed to know Hegeler quite well. The individual had written to the effect that Hegeler "was an extreme radical, and very fond of having his own way; that he had been in negotiation with two other gentlemen besides (and I suppose before) yourself, who insisted on the most absolute guarantee

in writing, of their exclusive control of the proposed paper—and they could not obtain satisfactory terms." Underwood informed Hegeler that he responded to the gentlemen's letter by indicating that he must be in error because Hegeler "is too reasonable a man to wish me, on account of his ownership of the magazine, to surrender my independence in the management of the enterprise."[13]

Hegeler agreed in part to Underwood's insistence on independence in the editorial and management side of the magazine writing: "I would have nothing to do with you if you did not show the full manhood which you express in your letter to your friend." However, he wanted Underwood to understand that he (Hegeler) would "be held as much responsible as yourself, even if I contribute the money only for the publication." A day later, Hegeler wrote him again with the intent to clarify the differences in their precise roles. "The real position is that of a *partnership* where one is *usually the silent partner,* and does not unnecessarily annoy the other. Such *mutual restraint as that implies,* is the real relation."[14]

Rather than continue to negotiate their differences, Underwood suggested they move forward with the publication of the first issue with Hegeler as proprietor and Underwood as editor and manager without informing the public of the details "on which we are not yet fully agreed." The following day, he informed Hegeler that "a sentence defining your position as a Monist be incorporated into the prospectus of the new magazine, or at any rate, be kept as a standing notice." If this is done, he hoped it would substitute for having the term "Monist" as the name of the magazine.[15]

Several days later, after not receiving a reply, Underwood restated his intent to name the magazine "The Open Court." In return, he argued that Hegeler could open each issue with a statement expressing his Monist views while "leaving the editors free and independent in all that pertains to their department." While he reiterated his opinion that Hegeler's beliefs would not be of particular interest to subscribers, he promised nonetheless to make them known. Noting that many of *The Index's* subscribers had requested transfers of their subscriptions to

The Open Court, he suggested that they desist trying to define precisely their relationship (i.e., proprietor vs. editorial and managerial control) and instead "leave this matter to be tested by experience." The next day, he wrote again giving his terms for the magazine, and warned that unless Hegeler's response showed sufficient agreement between them, he would inform the trustees of the Free Religious Association of the project's failure. Three days later, Hegeler capitulated and informed Underwood that he was satisfied with the name *The Open Court* and promised to send him a declaration of principles stating his purpose.[16]

On December 24, 1886, Hegeler sent Underwood his statement of principles: "The leading object of *The Open Court* will be to continue the work of The *Index*, — that is, to establish religion on the basis of science, and in connection therewith it will endeavor to present the Monistic philosophy. The founder of the magazine believes this will furnish to others, as it has done to him, a religion that replaces that which we were taught in our childhood." He then recommended the inclusion of a standing notice at the head of the magazine stating the following:

> While the proprietor of this magazine desires to spread by it the Monistic philosophy and the religion it brings with it, the editors are free and independent in all that pertains to their department, the proprietor reserving the right to express, over his own name, any difference of opinions from those expressed by the editors, and also to present, or have presented, his views over his own name.[17]

Hegeler also informed Underwood that their differences should be open to the public. "Nothing will demonstrate your independence better," he argued. Furthermore, he had no intention of keeping his name or their differences from being known to subscribers. "For this reason alone I want this misunderstanding explained, even if I have to ask that a supplemental number be issued for that purpose alone." Underwood accepted Hegeler's changes and *The Index* officially ended.

Based on the understandings reached between the two men, Hegeler formed the Open Court Publishing Company in early 1887. On the first

page of the *Notebook of Minutes of Meetings of the Directors of the Open Court Publishing Company* is a notice that the undersigned subscribers, Edward C. Hegeler, Eugene E. Prussing, Benjamin F. Underwood, and Camilla Hegeler, agreed to pay the company for each share the amount of one hundred dollars when called upon by the Directors of the company. Beside each name were the shares of stock owned by the four: Hegeler, 97 shares; Prussing, 1; Underwood, 1; and Camilla Hegeler, 1. This made the total value of the shares an amount equivalent to $10,000. On the second page was a notice sent to Camilla Hegeler notifying her that "the capital stock of the Open Court Publishing Company has been fully subscribed, and that a meeting of the subscribers to the capital stock of said company, will be held at Room No. 32 Borden Block, Chicago, Illinois on the fifth day of February A.D. 1887 at 4 o'clock P.M. for the purpose of electing a Board of Directors for said Company and for the transaction of such other business as may be deemed necessary." The notice was dated January 25, 1887.[18]

There is reason to believe that Room 32 in the Borden Block office building, located at the northwest corner of Randolph and Dearborn, housed the law office of Eugene E Prussing (1855-1936) who was a successful lawyer and co-founder of the Law Club, the Judges' Table at the Union League Club, a member of the Ethical Society of Chicago, President of the Citizens Association of Chicago, and an advocate for corporate reform. He authored a pamphlet titled "Making Trust Companies Universal" which was put into law by the Illinois General Assembly in 1887 and 1889, and subsequently adopted by many other states. He practiced law for many years in Chicago before moving to California in 1918.

The next documentation in the *Notebook of Minutes Meetings* reports a meeting dated February 11, 1887, in Room 217 at the Palmer House in Chicago, where the four stockholders of the Open Court Publishing Company met to elect its Board of Directors. The results of the election made Edward C. Hegeler, president; Camilla Hegeler, vice president; Eugene E. Prussing, secretary; and Benjamin F. Underwood, treasurer. Besides the election of officers, the minutes reported three other actions. In its first action, the Board agreed to create a fortnightly

magazine titled "The Open Court;" second, the Board agreed that the company would enter into a contract with Underwood for one year to conduct the magazine as editor and business manager upon such terms as agreed with the company's president; and third, the Board approved the use of the corporate seal, "The Open Court Publishing Co. of Chicago, Illinois," for authorized purposes. Although Underwood would resign his position as editor and business manager effective December 1887, he remained a shareholder in the company until February 10, 1903, when his title as treasurer and his share was transferred to Paul Carus; and Prussing's title as secretary to the board and his share was transferred to Mary Carus.[19]

The Open Court

Six days later, on February 17, 1887, *The Open Court* made its debut, selling for 15 cents a copy, or $3 per year. Published every other Thursday from its offices at 169-175 La Salle Street (Nixon Building), at the corner of Monroe, it included advertisements from the Society for Ethical Culture, the Free Religious Association, and a half dozen book publishers. Over time, the advertisements would grow many-fold, a positive sign of the magazine's success. Its masthead, "A Fortnightly Magazine Devoted to the Work of Establishing Ethics and Religion upon a Scientific Basis," stood as a reminder to existing and new subscribers that the magazine was a continuation of *The Index*, including the Free Religious Association's philosophy of "Liberty and Light." As such, it suggested a strong emphasis on rational ethics, exposing the corruption of orthodox religion, and stressing the importance of the separation of Church and State. Another point of focus for the magazine was evident in the editor's unqualified support for agnosticism, something that Hegeler had strenuously opposed. Finally, Underwood advocated the establishment of religion on the basis of science and promised in future issues to present the monistic philosophy which the publisher believed **"**will furnish to others what it has to him, a religion which embraces all that is true and good in the religion that was taught in childhood to them and him."[20]

While recognizing Hegeler's objective of establishing a monistic religion built on science, Underwood made no attempt to hide his own opinion that Monism and Agnosticism were not to be viewed as antagonistic systems but rather as "positive and negative aspects of the one and only rational scientific philosophy which . . . includes elements of truth common to all religions, without implying either the validity of theological assumption, or any limitations of possible knowledge, except such as the conditions of human thought impose."[21]

In his "Salutatory" editorial to subscribers, Underwood affirmed the magazine's commitment to free thought as opposed to "the authority of any alleged book-revelations or traditional beliefs." Explicit in this commitment was his promise to treat all questions according to the scientific method by using the "fullest knowledge and the best thought of the day." As editor and manager, he made known that the subjects he preferred to publish were those that addressed "the positive, affirmative side of radical liberal thought." This meant his preferences for topics of practical interest over those of pure speculation, giving a fair hearing to different schools of thought, being liberal in the broadest sense, and showing allegiance to no particular party or sect.[22]

Consistent with his agreement with Hegeler, the first issue included giving the publisher the opportunity to express his views to readers. Hegeler did this in an article titled, "The Basis of Ethics," which he took from a presentation he had given a month earlier before the Society for Ethical Culture of Chicago. Reflecting the views of the French psychological investigator Théodule-Armand Ribot and the English philosopher Herbert Spencer, he explained that the organized whole of man's ideas constituted the soul, and what was good for the soul was also good for the organism and for organized society. If, on the other hand, the good was happiness, then an evolved form of happiness became the basis for the greater good. Similarly, if the good was immortality, then an evolved form of it became the determining element in the good of man. "I am sure that nearly all of us are thinking in a vague manner of some kind of immortality, some kind of existence

after death," Hegeler observed. What made immortality certain to him was the realization that humans were "temporarily individualized parts" of the ALL. "Gradually there has been evolved from the rude soul of our distant ancestors our soul of today—our present civilization—and we hope it will further evolve in our posterity." To those ancestors who lived millions of years earlier, humanity owed it to their struggle and self-sacrifice that happiness for the good evolved from mere competition for existence to something intended for the betterment of all. "Science gives us the conviction . . . that evolution is taking place throughout the universe—that God and the universe are one—are the continuous ALL of which man is a limited part and phenomenon." Thus, the combination of preservation and evolution became the basis for the immortality of the soul and the true basis for a system of ethics.[23]

When originally delivered before the Society for Ethical Culture, the paper sparked considerable discussion, much of which Underwood included at the end of the article. Some of the discussants cautioned Hegeler against using the words "soul" and "immortality" since they were terms that had been egregiously distorted by organized religion. Their meaning was "loaded down" with superstition, a situation that arguably made the case for inventing new terminology. More serious criticism came from M. C. O'Byrne who called Hegeler's presentation a serious attempt using "hyper-subtle, though ingenious, reasoning" to provide a "succedaneum" for the Christian doctrine of immortality.[24]

What dominated the discussion, however, was the general feeling that life's decisions were not always made for the "good" of the world. In other words, there were many instances of decisions that did not serve the good of mankind. Since the good was not absolute, then seeking and furthering the good could sometimes be less than ideal. For some, it meant "a contention, a fight, a struggle"—a highway of human progress paved with the bones of its weaker elements. This implied that only those strong in body and mind transmitted their acquired vigor to future generations. Beyond that, it was difficult to project true ethical progress.[25]

Underwood weighed into the discussion as well. Insisting that individual lives were without calculation or deliberation, he pointed to the existence of a vast train of experiences through countless generations that were acted out in the absence of any moral rules or principles whatsoever. That, too, was part of the mental constitution of man. On other occasions, man learned by experience the types or forms of contact that enhanced his wellbeing. The whole history of civilization was the record of experiences bringing man to his present moral condition, some of which involved suffering by the individual who endured it for the benefit of the whole; others, for no other purpose than fulfilling the simple functions of life.[26]

In what could arguably be termed a bit of peevishness, Underwood included a trenchant criticism of Hegeler's article from an anonymous subscriber. The editor's intent may have been innocent. However, given his own differences with Hegeler, the letter could also have been an effort to embarrass the publisher enough to keep his opinions out of future issues of the magazine.

> The effect of such a theory [Monism] upon society would be not only a great wrong, but a disaster, and reduce mankind to a mass of immoral animals wherein selfishness and rapine would rule with physical violence, and the laws of justice and humanity be as naught. It would remove the adequate motive which prompts men to be good, and leave in its place only a vapid idealism, negative and withering. These highfalutin theories may captivate and amuse the minds of wealthy philanthropic theorists who are too proud to follow the sure paths laid down by nobler though humbler minds, or they may entertain the innate capacities of the flatterers and sycophants who bask in the smiles of wealthy patrons, but they can never supplant the burning truths of Christianity sown in the depths of the human heart, and reaped in the harvest of justice, faith, hope and eternal love. The Open Court may be a forum for scoffing at the true good, but it can never in its present form be a hall of light and truth in which men can learn the right way to the better end.[27]

In answering his critic, Hegeler was not at all apologetic for his point of view since he believed that it was out of such antithetical differences that progress was possible. He had no reluctance in admitting his failure to provide appropriate definitions for words like "good," and not having done justice to Spencer's views. This was exactly what he wanted to happen in the magazine which he hoped would become a forum for a national and perhaps even an international conversation around the meaning and purpose of life.

But there were occasions when Hegeler met his match. When the American activist and leader of the women's rights movement, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, submitted an article titled "Jails and Jubilees," Underwood enthusiastically published it. In it, Stanton minced no words. She accused England of being "the most brutal government on the face of the earth" by supporting a royal family whose Irish subjects were evicted from their homes at the point of bayonets, and whose jails were the outgrowth of poverty. Furthermore, she criticized Queen Victoria for being complicit in offering her people statues instead of schools and bread for the hungry. In response to the crown's lack of interest in her millions of subjects, Stanton threw the proverbial "round cake" against the wall as a sign of her disapproval.[28] In response, Hegeler found himself duty-bound to write that "the worst enemy of woman is woman" as she seemed to be the severest judge condemning the real and supposed faults of her sisters. That Stanton disparaged the queen and the royal family seemed unjust and unwarranted.[29]

Stanton responded, noting that Hegeler's opinion, especially in such an influential journal, could not pass unchallenged. Besides being a "wholesale libel on womanhood," she pointed out that the established customs of all nations, even the most civilized, showed that woman's worst enemy was man. "Hence to make woman responsible for any of the evils, moral or material, that have grown out of her enforced condition of ignorance and folly is to the last degree unreasonable."

> Mr. Hegeler says he never read a harsher criticism of Victoria than my article in *The Open Court.* If mine has been the one discordant note in the grand jubilee chorus to the Queen, it is because behind

> all the busy preparations for the most brilliant pageant the world has ever witnessed, of gilded royalty and nobility, my eyes beheld the dark shadows on the background of homeless, starving men, women and children, into whose desolate lives would never come one touch of light or love. There is something to me unspeakably sad in the eager gazing multitudes that crowd the streets on these grand gala days. There is ever a sphinxlike questioning look in their upturned faces, that seems to say, "must the many ever suffer that the few may shine?" As the sun went down on that 21st of June, what a contrast in the close of the day's festivities between the children of luxury and want.[30]

Also in the magazine's inaugural issue was William J. Potter's "Society and the Individual" which addressed the social, political, and ethical problems attendant to the individual's relationship with society. Seeking to avoid the dangerous impulses of individual acquisition when carried to excess, Potter looked to nature for signs that a species improved through cooperation. In doing this, Potter found the instincts of self-preservation and self-aggrandizement especially strong in the early years of life, but which later refocused on the whole social organism whose end was "the common good, the general well-being." This was the second part of nature's lesson which began with impulses of individual acquisition but which over time carried corresponding obligations to the greater society. All were meliorations that marked "the progress of the higher civilization, for which individual self-interest and enterprise only furnish the rough material." To ensure this, laws were needed to keep the peace between competing self-interests.[31]

In yet another article titled "The Need for Free Thought Education," author Thomas Davidson argued that the greatest foe to human liberty and to the Republic continued to be the tyrannical influence of the Roman Church that had enslaved people by infusing their thoughts with entrenched affections, habits, and prejudices. It was important, warned Davidson, to protect the young by replacing "ecclesiastical obscurantism" with real and not pretended solutions to questions that demanded attention. "To put men off, as the Church does, with an authoritative answer, which is, indeed, no answer at all, is a piece of the

most utter frivolity, an unsurpassable lesson in intellectual impiety and dishonesty—the source of all other dishonesty." Instead, society had an obligation to use science to identify and answer questions correctly while bravely recognizing the limitations and mysteries that surrounded life. Free thought must not fall into the hands of "enslaved thinkers" which was exactly what the Church's teachings perpetuated. To prevent this, Davidson urged free thinkers to consider establishing their own schools. There was much to learn from the Roman Church which had a long history of establishing schools of its own. If imitated, this could culminate in the creation of free-thought schools and colleges to offset Catholicism and its pernicious influence.[32]

Along with the above was Minot J. Savage's "A Theological Paradox" which claimed that orthodox Christianity had maintained a house for its believers long after its foundations had crumbled. The structure, which Christianity had erected around the story of the Garden of Eden, included six elements: the world was in a state of rebellion beginning with the state of nature which was one of alienation from God and all that was good; God had the perfect right to choose the terms required as the condition of forgiveness; God had to make a public example of his hatred of sin to justify his pardon and love; God was free to pardon those who accepted his offering; and the Church consisted of those who accepted God's terms, and those who were loyal were entitled to share in God's blessings. None of these elements, Savage insisted, had any more credibility than the fables of Hercules.[33]

Other articles included Frederic May Holland's "King Voltaire" who led Europe out of the persecutions and religious wars of Christianity; B. W. Ball's "The Two Hemispheres" which contrasted Europe with the continent of North America; associate editor Sarah Underwood's memorial to Charles Darwin who had died the previous month at his home in Down, England; and Edmund Montgomery's "Monism in Modern Philosophy and the Agnostic Attitude of Mind." Montgomery had become a close friend of Underwood when he edited *The Index* and continued their friendship after Underwood became editor of *The Open Court.*[34] As a metaphysician confronted with materialism, Montgomery chose a middle course, finding the source of life in "vital organization,"

a molecular theory of vitality, meaning the spontaneous generation of the forms of life.[35]

In general, publishers welcomed *The Open Court* as the legitimate successor to *The Index.* One of the more interesting comments came from the *Boston Herald* which observed that although it would have been better had the magazine remained in the East rather than settling in Chicago, the change appeared surprisingly more positive than originally feared. "Many of the old standbys are here in their proper place, but one recognizes a more philosophical tone of thought, a more constructive view of life, a stronger grip on things essential."[36] Other comments were similarly positive.

> Typographically speaking The Open Court makes a handsome appearance, as it is neatly printed, and its contents are rather interesting, being a decided improvement on any other religious magazine that comes to this office, now that the Index has disappeared. (*Boston Investigator*)
>
> The first number just out, is a notable issue both in contents and typographical appearance, and is a worthy champion of the cause to which it is dedicated. (*Boston Budget*).
>
> It will doubtless find readers to whom it will become a necessity and an efficient helper. (*Chicago Tribune*).
>
> It was too late last week, when we discovered our new contemporary, The Open Court, nestling among our exchanges, to extend to it a fraternal welcome. We stretch our hand across the continent, however, this week, to shake hands with this new representative of free thought. The Open Court is what in the West would be called a "broad-gauge" paper, and it starts with a good head of steam and well-freighted columns. From the Register's standpoint, it does not seem exactly as if The Open Court were on the right track, theologically; and, if Orthodoxy is right, the final experience of our contemporary, must be one of wreck and conflagration. But we are glad to say that it exhibits high ability as well as freedom in thought;

and we may be sure, under Mr. Underwood's editorship, that its moral tone will be lofty and commanding. (*Christian Register*).[37]

* * *

Notwithstanding the positive reviews, the omens were not all good. While outwardly seen as a success, the first issue of *The Open Court* failed to embrace the full measure of Hegeler's views as had been agreed in their correspondence. The lapse of judgement, whether intended or not, caused Hegeler to request a meeting with Underwood where, in the presence of his attorney, Charles K. Whipple, they codified in a document the mutual expectations of publisher and editor. Nevertheless, over the following months, the relationship between them continued to deteriorate even further, due in no small degree to the addition of a young German tutor in the Hegeler household.[38]

Chapter 3

The Intruder

Paul Carus (1852-1919) was the son of Wilhelm Friedrich Gustav Carus, a Lutheran pastor at Ilsenburg am Harz and later elevated to First Superintendent of the Church of Eastern and Western Prussia. Initially intending to follow his father's footsteps into the ministry, Paul attended the gymnasia at Posen and then at Stettin (where his father officiated as minister) where he studied mathematics, physics, and the classics under the direction of mathematician and Sanskrit scholar Hermann Günther Grassmann, the author of *Die Lineale Ausdehnungslehre, ein neuer Zweig der Mathematik* (1844) and his *Worterbuch zum Rig-veda* (1873), a collection of pre-Buddhist religious hymns from the 12th to the 6th century B.C. After experiencing a crisis of faith, Carus turned to philosophy, philology, and the natural sciences, aspiring to become a teacher rather than a preacher. "From my childhood," he recalled, "I was devout and pious; my faith was as resolute as that of Simon whom, for his firmness, Christ called the rock of His church.[1] But, as William E. Leonard explained, "Paul Carus, like so many men of his generation, suffered the spiritual tragedy of a household faith in ruins; and the waves swept him far out to sea. But he was a young and vigorous swimmer, and wrestled in the dark. He found shore in a new faith of science, far from all old doorways. But the old emotional attitude, the old imaginative moment had not altered."[2] Seeking a worldview compatible with what he had found in the sciences, he attended first the University of Greifswald, then Strasburg where he studied the natural sciences, psychology, and philosophy, and finally Tübingen, the original hotbed of the Higher Criticism, where he earned his Ph.D. in 1876 in classical philology. That

same year at Halle, he passed his examination for teaching in a state institution.

After serving a compulsory two years in the Saxon Field Artillery (1876-77), he took several temporary teaching assignments before accepting an appointment at the Royal Corps of Cadets Military Academy in Dresden where he taught Latin, German, and history. Unfortunately, his appointment turned out to be less than permanent. While there, he published *Helgi und Sigrum, ein epische Gedicht der nordischen Sage* (1880) and *Metaphysik in Wissenschaft, Ethik und Religion eine philosophische Untersuhung* (1881) in which, while praising the literary beauty of Scripture, cautioned that it not be read in any strictly literal sense. Troubled by his liberal views and the obvious influence of the Higher Critics, the Saxon Minister of War raised concerns with the school's authorities who insisted on a retraction. Although the German Civil Service could have protected Carus from being removed from his position, rather than wallow in guilt for retracting something he firmly believed, and wishing to retain absolute independence for his views, he resigned from the position in 1881, and resigned as well from Bismarck's repressive Germany.[3]

New Beginnings

Following his resignation, Carus made one last tour of the continent before taking up residence in England for three years. During that time, he authored *Algenor: eine episch-lyrische Dichtung* (1882), *Gedichte* (1882), *Lieder eines Buddhisten* (1882), *Ursache, Grund und Zweck: eine philosophische Untersuchung zur Klärung der Begriffe* (1883), and *Aus dem Exil* (1884), reflecting his personal struggle to identify a type or form of belief somewhere between mysticism and atheism.[4] In 1884, he immigrated to the United States where, not unlike many young adults in his day, he sought to test his abilities and aspirations, believing the nation offered the opportune place and time to make his mark in the world. On his arrival in Boston, he found employment teaching German in the local schools before moving to New York City where he stayed for three years, working first as a teacher of the classical languages, and then as co-editor of the German American magazine, Zickel's

Novellen-schatz und Familien blätter, and occasionally contributing poetry to *The Index,* the left-wing Unitarian magazine published by the Free Religious Association edited by Benjamin and Sara Underwood.

In 1885, Carus's struggle to reconcile his religious feelings with the findings of science culminated in the publication of *Monism and Meliorism, A Philosophical Essay on Causality and Ethics.* Monism (sometimes called "New Positivism" the "Philosophy of Science," and "New Realism") stood for a conception of the world that traced everything, including the soul of man, to a single source or principle. It conceived the world as "one inseparable and indivisible entirety" corroborated by science. Meliorism, on the other hand, stood for a view of life that, rejecting both optimism and pessimism, found purpose in man's "aspiration . . . to some higher state of existence."[5]

Appreciative of what Comte and his school of Positivism had achieved, Carus nonetheless accused him of being agnostic to the core, unable to identify a "touchstone" on which to distinguish whether matter was a positive fact, or an illusion. Instead of addressing this basic problem in philosophy, Comte declared it "unsolvable." Similarly, Spencer accomplished a great deal through his system for collecting and systematizing matter, but he too, ended in agnosticism. "We have a high respect for Mr. Spencer as a man and a thinker, but it is a great pity that with all his brilliant talents . . . he is a dilettante. . . . Mr. Spencer, as a thinker, follows the principle of Hedonism; he shirks the toil of research and engages in such subjects only as can easily be woven into feuilletonistic essays."[6]

Finally, Carus examined Kant who had constructed a philosophy that had stood its ground against the spiritualism of George Berkeley and the materialism endorsed by Condillac, Holbach, and their free thought supporters. Nevertheless, he too, failed to solve the problem, losing himself in "the intricate paths and windings of his strange idealism." Although Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) had shown that beliefs about the soul, world, and God, which had stood for more than a thousand years were merely *noumena* (i.e., concepts), he failed to find any "higher unity," meaning there was no tie with which to bind

together the cosmos. This failure led to Carus's decision to add Monism to the philosophy of Positivism. "True positivism is monistic," he wrote, and "true monism is positive."[7]

As a Monist, Carus rejected "first" and "final" causes, insisting they were complicit with outdated theology. Instead, he substituted the term *finis,* an idea that affirmed a purpose or an ideal towards which the cosmos was moving.

> Only by knowing the *finis,* the *whither* of the development of the world, can we find out the nature and *character* of the final principle of the cosmos, which represents the *whence* of all movement in the universe, the ultimate ground and source from which all activity starts. Now, if the tendency of amelioration prevails everywhere, we should apply this law to the final principle, which pervades the macrocosm. So the aspiration towards ever higher aims on the high road of infinitude and eternity seems to be the inmost, the sublimest and grandest characteristic of this final interior of nature, the groundwork of the world.[8]

Monism implied a unity or principle that permeated the cosmos, inclusive of all things spiritual and material towards which evolution tended. "Things are not single existences, but form one entire whole" and all tendencies, while seemingly different, aspired toward the same *finis.* In the world of Monism, spirit and matter were mere abstracts—the oneness of all existence with no differences of kind, no Creator or created, no supernatural or natural. Instead, God and the universe were one, replacing the ego-centric consciousness of man with the consciousness of the All-One. Reality was indivisible even between the organic and inorganic. Rejecting Cartesian dualism, Monism denied any split between the subjective and objective—the enigma that had proved to be so incomprehensible. [9]

Considering both religion (provided it was approached scientifically) and science as opposites sides of the same coin, Carus proposed that a proper study of both resulted in "one law only in the world which in its

purely formal relations is the condition of all uniformities in the world."[10] For lack of a better word, the eternal laws of form stood for Carus's God, the *principle* of form. It was Grassmann's theory of forms that had captured Carus's attention and justified his belief that *form* was the real essence of things, the ultimate source of the law or force that he called God or the ALL. "If you could annihilate matter and energy there would be left, as an intrinsic reality from which neither existence nor non-existence could escape, the eternal laws of form, which philosophers . . . termed the purely formal sciences, viz., logic, arithmetic, geometry, pure mechanics, and pure natural science." God, or the ALL, was the sum total of the omnipresent laws or forms.[11]

While Christian theologians based their ethics on the Ten Commandments (i.e., the authority of an anthropomorphic God), the Spencerians on the principle of happiness or hedonism, and others on utilitarianism, asceticism, or some other form, Carus insisted that "a life worthy to be lived [was one] full of active aspiration for something higher and better" which he identified as *meliorism*.[12] Meliorism was not a regulative law but a natural law and indicative of the fact that the purpose of an organism's existence was something higher than itself, a characteristic that pervaded all of organic nature. "Though the world is full of evil and misery at present, it will in time become good and perfect; that evolution tends to a constant amelioration which by and by will lead to the abolition of all pain and a condition of undisturbed happiness."[13]

> So man and the society of man rest on the same principle. The first higher unity is the family; families grow into tribes, and tribes form nations. The love of parents has broadened into patriotism, and no doubt the next higher ideal will be that of humanity. The next higher stage to which development ever tends is the *ideal,* and there will be no rest in the minds of single individuals until this ideal is realized. After that, new ideals arise and lead on the interminable, infinite path of progress, not as Darwin says, merely ruled by the famous law of the struggle for life, but enhanced by the *strife for the ideal*.[14]

Meeting the Man

On January 21, 1887, Hegeler wrote Carus thanking him for the copy of *Monism and Meliorism* that he had sent, as well as his book on poems, *Ein Leben in Liedern, Gedichte Eines Heimathlosen* (1886) that Benjamin Underwood had passed on to him at Carus's request. Hegeler not only appreciated the gifts but, agreeing with so much that Carus had written, offered him employment as a tutor for his older children and the position of associate editor of *The Open Court* whose first issue had come out a week earlier and which he felt Carus could contribute by soliciting manuscripts from abroad. In Carus' response, he agreed that as a rule most magazines—both literary and scientific—gave little attention to French and German periodicals which contained "immense treasures" inaccessible to most American readers. As a consequence, it had been his intention to establish a magazine titled "Transatlantic Review" to summarize much of the intellectual activity of Central Europe. All he lacked was a publisher with the necessary capital. Given that Hegeler had established a magazine with a similar scientific focus, perhaps the editor could assign to him a certain amount of space in each issue that could be titled "The Transatlantic Review."[15]

Hegeler's offer, made without consulting Underwood, caused another rift in the already fragile relationship between the publisher and his editor, and now between the editor and Carus who Underwood accused of being an unprincipled conniver. Because of Underwood's adamant refusal to entertain the addition of Carus to the staff of the magazine, Hegeler wrote Carus explaining that since he had made Underwood an independent editor and manager of the magazine, the position of associate editor was not immediately available. Instead, he suggested that, as his personal secretary, Carus could take charge of his correspondence with German scholars and writers, including translation of their articles into English for publication in the magazine. Interpreting Hegeler's letter as an offer for a combined position, Carus gladly accepted and arrived in La Salle in March 1887 in time to assist Hegeler with his drafts of articles intended for *The Open Court.*[16]

Where There's Smoke

While the Underwoods worked out of the offices of the Open Court in Chicago, a distance of ninety-five miles by train from La Salle, the knowledge that Carus was now working as Hegeler's secretary became a festering sore for the couple. Not only was Carus participating in daily conversations with the publisher, but he had also begun courting the family's eldest daughter Mary.[17]

Nevertheless, Underwood kept his word by allowing the magazine to introduce Hegeler's ideas to readers. What he objected to was the succession of articles written by Carus which seemed to parrot Hegeler's ideas. When he complained, Hegeler explained that it was possible Carus might return to Germany to become a professor at a university and earn him standing should he (Hegeler) wish to organize a college for philosophy and scientific religion in the United States, an idea that he had been considering for some time. In either case, he wanted Carus to continue contributing to the magazine and represent the publisher's views.[18]

What followed were a series of articles by Carus that Hegeler directed Underwood to publish. According to Harold Henderson in *Catalyst for Controversy* (1993), Underwood found them "an irritation and an embarrassment."[19] In particular, Underwood objected to Hegeler's use of the magazine to advance the work of one particular author, his children's tutor, because it violated the very definition of the word "open" in the magazine's name and undermined its philosophical neutrality by advocating the publisher's missionary bias towards Monism. Nevertheless, the first of the articles began in the second (March 3, 1887) issue titled "The Harmony of the Spheres." Based on Pythagoras' doctrine that numbers were at the very essence of things, Carus claimed unity in the structure of the universe and in the laws of nature. This so-called "harmony of spheres" favored the truth of the philosophy known as Monism whose ultimate principles were based on mathematics.[20] This was followed by "Théodule-Armand Ribot on

Memory" in the June 23 issue;[21] "Goethe and Schiller's Xenions"[22] in the July 21 issue; "Ribot on Diseases of Memory" in the August 4 issue;[23] and "Ribot on the Will"[24] in the September 29 issue. Underwood found this altogether too excessive.

As the weeks went by, the tensions between the editor and Hegeler's secretary soured as their correspondence indicated a growing distaste for the other's point of view. In response to one of Underwood's letters, Carus minced few words.

> You are quite mistaken with regard to my ambition and aspirations. Here is not the place to give you any information concerning them, but that much you should know that my aims are higher than to see my name as often as possible in *The Open Court.* I have requested Mr. Hegeler to omit my name from the translations so as to meet your objection. But he refused to do so. You are right in praising Mr. Hegeler's magnificence and liberality, but when you say of me that Mr. Hegeler "is kept in the background while you have been to the front as a contributor, translator and reviewer," could you not say the very same of yourself. . . . I work for Mr. Hegeler not as a mouthpiece of his views but propounding my notions on his request which to a great extent are in harmony with his views. As long as we have to deal with each other officially—and if I can realize certain plans outside of the Open Court—that I wish that both of us might avoid all unnecessary conflicts. . . . I hope that all our differences can be settled easier—and perhaps for good—if we meet personally. Written communications are often misinterpreted and I am confident still that you do not mean to be so aggressive as you appear in your communications. Nor do I want to take away your time which could be better employed than in waging a useless warfare with me.[25]

When Carus's article, "Monism, Dualism, and Agnosticism" was sent to Underwood for publication, Underwood knew it was the product of both Carus and the publisher since Carus used the pronoun "we." In it, Carus denied the legitimate existence of either spirit or matter, force or matter, the subjective or the objective. Instead, it was only "by

treating both as a unity and having one common basis," that modern science rested.

> Monism is in opposition to the old theology, for there is no room in monism for the supernatural. Marvels and special revelations are impossible, if monism is a truth, and more than that, not only the intercession of a capricious Deity becomes a legend, but the supernatural itself is eliminated forever. In the monistic view, the supernatural exists neither in nor above nature. All is natural, and if you speak of God it is the great. All in which we live, and move, and have our being, of whom the Apostle says that in the end he will be all in all.[26]

Several issues later, Underwood wrote an editorial titled, "Monism and Monistic Thinkers," in which he challenged Carus (and Hegeler) by pointing out that there were many different conceptions of monism, all of which were opposed to dualism. There was the monism of Spinoza which identified God and nature in an absolute substance that possessed both thought and extension; the monism of Schelling which was a system of "transcendental realism;" Eduard von Hartman's "philosophy of the Unconscious;" Hegel's monism of "self-evolving logical reason;" Spencer's different modes of absolute inscrutable Power; Haeckel's mechanical monism in which every atom was eternal and aggregated into combinations to form the souls of men; and Hegeler's monotheism which he regarded as a religious form of monism. Given these different theories could not all be true, it was highly unlikely that even one of them contained the entire truth.[27]

Soon afterward, the magazine printed Sara Underwood's poem, "I Do Not Know," in defense of agnosticism and an obvious challenge to Hegeler's objective for the magazine.

"I Do Not Know"
By Sara A. Underwood.

> You sorrow, friend, that your faith is not mine;
> You vainly grieve because when Death shall call

I own I know not where I go, or if at all
I go, or stay, cease being, or enter some new life divine.
I grieve but for your grieving! Once in youth
Your faith was mine; and when Death came too near
I faced him terror-stricken: believing fear,
Possessed my soul when I thought creed was truth.
Some truth since then I've learned, and by its test
Have found the creeds to totter, crumble, fail,
Their seeming strength built on foundations frail,
On crude imaginings, man's hope and fear at best.
Once, in my ignorance, I glibly prated
Of devils, pains, and penalties; of God and bliss,
Reward and punishment. But now I know but this:
I do not know to what humanity is fated
Save that which men name death—the sure estate
Which comes to all alike—the sphinxlike unrevealer
Of Life's enigma,—the dumb tantalizing sealer
Of the unanswered questions put by man to Fate.
But we know not—though much we long to know
What Death may be: beginning, mean, or end,
Or whether it comes as teacher, foe, or friend
Our eager questioning wins not "Aye" or "No."
To all alike it comes; the great, the wise, the good,
The sinful, sad, the strong, the weak, the gay,
The saint, the hypocrite, the prophet, each one day
Receives the summons —no matter in what mood.
Yet death I fear not—souls as weak and blind
As mine its dark ordeal have passed serene,
Why should I falter at some change of scene,
Which I but share with all my human kind?
But should immortal life, my friend, be ours,
I shall be glad as you—and try to scale
With you its further heights, if strivings then avail
With joy accepting all my new-born powers.
Mayhap then, by some alchemy here unknown,
Our baser natures may toward their likings stray
And hateful qualities drop from us quite away,

While what is best within us seeks its own.
And if —as may be—for I do not, cannot, know,
To unsufficing life, death brings sure end
I need not murmur—nor need you, my friend,
Whose creed, believed, means far less joy than woe.
I say " I do not know"—most surely do not,
Yet have I caught faint gleams of what seemed light--
In hours, in ways, too sacred here to cite,
Like gleaming from a distant star we view not.[28]

When Underwood visited La Salle in early September, Hegeler used the opportunity to take exception to the agnostic character of the magazine which was against his intentions. Despite the editor's denial, the publisher pointed to Sara Underwood's poem that had been written as an editorial and which directly and explicitly demonstrated their refusal to recognize and support the purpose of the magazine. He also reminded Underwood that he still intended to add Paul Carus as an associate editor and considered the appointment to be "the most important part of the paper" in that Carus was in harmony with his views. Carus would be there to present the publisher's views which were Hegeler's right. Carus also would handle the magazine's correspondence with European writers whose contributions would require translation.[29]

In the next issue, Underwood published Hegeler's essay on "The Soul" which defined the word as a *form* that stood for an abstraction of something real, as in human living brain-matter, energy, and feeling. It implied something that man had beyond what was common with the lower animals. Unlike the animal kingdom, man had the ability to form the soul through education, thus preserving and elevating the present generation for the betterment of the next. This became the primary aim of ethics.[30]

Although animals shared more or less the same qualities, what distinguished the human soul had been made clear to Hegeler by Gustav Freytag, one of his favorite authors, who in *The Lost Manuscript* (1865) remarked that almost all that is called "learning" was found in books: "They [books] are the greatest treasure keepers of the human

race. They preserve all that is most valuable of what has ever been taught or discovered from one century to another, and they proclaim what was once existing upon the earth." Though few books maintained their importance for all times, their content continued the life of the soul into the future. The soul, which people of past generations felt as their own, consisted of what others had written and contributed to future generations. This was the true meaning of immortality.

> No one who has written a book has of himself become what he is; everyone stands on the shoulders of his predecessor; all that was produced before his time has helped to form his life and soul. Again, what he has produced has in some sort formed other men, and thus his soul has passed to later times. In this way the contents of all books form one great soul-empire on earth, and all who now write, life and nourish themselves on the souls of the past generations. . . . From this point of view, the soul of mankind is one interminable unity. Every single individual belongs to it—he who lived and worked in past times as well as he who now breathes and creates ideas. The soul which people of past generations felt as their own was and is still transmitted to others. What has been written today will tomorrow perhaps, be the possession of many thousand strangers. Who long ago returned his body to nature, continues to live on earth in an increasingly renewed existence, and comes to new life again daily in others.[31]

As he looked for more confirmation of Freytag's explanation, Hegeler became enamored with Thomas Edison's phonographic cylinders and compared the soul to the indentation in the wax or hard rubber where the voice of an individual was imbedded. The soul reminded him of a "living phonogram in intimate connection with a certain class of . . . memories." Although death annihilated the individual, his ideas, like the voices imbedded in the phonographic cylinders, were transmitted to others and lived on in a newer existence. What an individual said lived on in the brains of others. Whenever anyone used another's ideas, there was a part of someone's soul that lived on.[32]

Years later, Edison explained to Edward Marshall, a reporter for the *New York Times*, there was no existence beyond the grave—no individuality of the soul, only an aggregate of souls. Edison expected to live in his various inventions. Immortality was for everyone, and for Edison, it meant that his immortality would also live in the brain of other inventors who carried on his work.

> There is no more reason to believe that any human brain will be immortal than there is to think that one of my phonographic cylinders will be immortal. My phonographic cylinders are mere records of sounds which have been impressed upon them. . . . After death the force, or power, we call will undoubtedly endures; but it endures in this world, not in the next. . . . Because we are as yet unable to understand it, we call it immortal. It is the ignorant, lazy man's refuge. There are plenty of savages, you know, who still call fire immortal. . . . This brain of ours is a queer and wonderful machine. What is known as the fold of Broca, at its base, is where lie stored our impressions in order in which they are received. There, for instance, is where our knowledge of our mother tongue is stored. It is definitely stored there, and there is definitely where it is stored, just as if that part of the brain was the particular phonographic cylinder on which it had been recorded. Machinery, pure and simple. . . . Why should it be immortal? It is merely a machine.[33]

Clearing the Air

Feeling overwhelmed by what he interpreted as a deliberate effort to undermine his role as manager and editor, Underwood wrote Hegeler on October 14 asking for a copy of the document prepared by Charles Whipple that formed their legal contract. Hegeler responded that he put little value in the contract as "it was incorrect and incomplete on the essential points," and remembered Underwood as having mentioned the same. Underwood agreed to the defectiveness of the memorandum and gave his own understanding of their agreement, namely, that Hegeler

had the right to express his views and to criticize anything published in the magazine, and as editor, he was obliged to provide space for such criticism. Underwood only asked to be given advance notice of such intentions so he could plan for the other articles intended for the issue. Underwood continued to object to Carus's appointment on account of his being "a combative man who held to his opinions," and because Hegeler suggested that he and Carus "should jointly arrange the contents of the paper," with any disagreements referred to Hegeler to decide. Underwood rejected the arrangement, but agreed nevertheless to travel to La Salle to present the proposed contents of future issues to both Hegeler and Carus.[34]

Shortly afterward, when Underwood found it inconvenient to travel to La Salle to discuss the content of an upcoming issue, Hegeler proceeded to review the proposed contents in the company of Mary and Paul Carus which he returned with comments, including one article with the wording, "subject not suited for *The Open Court."* This action proved to be the final straw as it directly challenged the editor's authority to carry out his responsibilities as contracted with the Board. On October 28, Underwood informed Hegeler that the present management of the paper was not likely to last very long given the interference in the operation of the publication by Hegeler and members of his family. Furthermore, the condition of Carus having an editorial position on the magazine was one that he could "never agree so long as our relation to the paper continues." Therefore, he informed Hegeler that he and his wife tendered their resignations which would take effect at the end of the financial year of the magazine, or sooner if necessary. He then asked that a proper statement announcing their retirement be made in a manner mutually agreed to assure that it was "written in no pique, and in no unfriendly spirit." On November 7, Hegeler accepted their resignation and indicated that their salary would continue until the close of the year. In subsequent short notes to each other, the Underwoods agreed to end their involvement with the magazine with the publication of the 21st issue.[35]

In the November 24 issue, the Underwoods bid farewell to their readers. In their remarks, they noted that they had been editor and co-editor of *The Index* for five years before resigning to take charge of the new journalistic enterprise inaugurated by Hegeler and had done so in the belief that the new magazine would continue the work of *The Index* and saw no reason to believe that they would fail to succeed. Now, with the magazine not yet a year in production, they felt the circumstances surrounding its proper management had rendered it impossible for them to continue. Specifically, they pointed to Hegeler's intention to make a place for Paul Carus, his children's tutor, to be associate editor, a position his wife had held from the start. That Carus, who "never wrote a line for it except as a contributor and as Mr. Hegeler's secretary," was an insult they could not endure.[36]

Hegeler had the last word. Along with recounting his failed relationship with the Underwoods, he published a set of letters in the December 1887 issue of *The Open Court* documenting his relationship with the magazine's newly appointed editor and manager. He did this to dispel any misapprehension among subscribers that he had misrepresented his intentions as to what he expected of Benjamin Underwood, of Carus, and their relationship with the magazine. Hegeler made it clear in his documentation that after hiring Carus in early 1887, and before the young man had even arrived in La Salle and met members of his family, he had informed Underwood that he expected the young man to have an official connection with the magazine. At the time, Underwood only asked that it be delayed and Hegeler did not insist upon it. Finally, Hegeler reported that the magazine as managed by Underwood was costing $500 per issue above the revenue generated by subscriptions that Underwood had promised would materialize in the fall and winter months. At most, Underwood had estimated the additional cost of about $8,425 for the first year. However, his prediction for new subscriptions did not materialize, a situation that resulted in Hegeler assuming over $13,000 in excess publication costs besides paying off the debt left when *The Index* ceased publication. "I came to the conclusion that I had

done my share of giving Mr. Underwood an opportunity in the direction of reaching a business success."[37]

* * *

By publishing his correspondence with both Underwood and Carus, Hegeler sought to clear the air of any misconceptions subscribers might have had. Happily, his decision had its intended effects since there was little negative response to the change in editors. Given the differences of opinion regarding the naming of the magazine, however, one subscriber asked why Hegeler chose to continue with the name "The Open Court" when he could now change it to "The Monist." Hegeler replied that while the advice was well-intended, he did not wish to change the name now that it had become established and especially when its purpose (i.e., "to reconcile religion with science") was expressed on its title page. Besides, argued Hegeler, the words "The Open Court" signified his objective that all intelligent criticism was welcome whether he liked it, or not.[38]

Chapter 4

Ringing the Changes

On December 22, 1887, Paul Carus, the newly appointed editor and manager, announced a revised masthead for *The Open Court* which read, "A Fortnightly Magazine Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science." The change, he explained, represented a decision to replace the language in the former masthead (i.e., "A Fortnightly Magazine Devoted to the Work of Establishing Ethics and Religion on a Scientific Basis") which had essentially restated the tenets and ideals of the Free Religious Association rather than what the publisher intended. As editor and manager, Underwood preferred articles that touched on rational religion, ethics, reform, opposition to church orthodoxy, and the inadequacy of the Bible as a solution to the world's problems. With the magazine now in Carus' hands, he and Hegeler announced their intent to clarify and expand the emphasis on Monism, immortality, and the soul to the extent that readers would discover "the grandeur of the monistic view, and the religious depth of monistic psychology."[1] Accompanying the new masthead was an explanation informing readers they would find in its pages not only an effort to conciliate Religion and Science, but that their efforts would be carried out "with due reverence for the past and with full confidence in a higher future." While respecting the old creeds, they promised not to ignore their errors; nor would they permit the faults of the most radical thought be left unattended. Similarly, they promised to purify religion without harming its spirit provided "it will be found to satisfy the yearnings of the heart as well as the requirements of the intellect.[2]

Something Old, Something New

Under Carus's editorship, the magazine continued to publish the serialized articles initiated by Underwood which included Moncure D. Conway's "Chats with a Chimpanzee," George M. Gould's "The Ethics of Economics," and Edward D. Cope's "Theology of Evolution." Nevertheless, several differences emerged. One was Carus's and Hegeler's desire to fulfill their promise of expanding content by addressing monism, immortality, and the soul in all their variations. Indicative of this change, Carus serialized Freytag's novel *The Lost Manuscript* (1865) on account of the author's insight into the human soul and immortality, his monistic conception of the soul, and because Hegeler thought so highly of the author. Freytag's conception of the nature and preservation of the soul had been Hegeler's "leading motive in the publications of The Open Court Publishing Company."[3] Running through Freytag's thought (and surely that of Hegeler) was the belief that immortality consisted of reformulating the soul into two categories: that which reflected a person's own ideas, and that which was collective, representing the totality of one's culture. The soul was not anything immortal in the same sense that matter and energy were indestructible. On the contrary, it was every individual's responsibility to work out his or her immortality. Though the individual ceased to exist in death, his soul survived wherever his work, his thought, and his ideals persisted. Thus the development of the soul was humanity's most important task in that it was also the basis for ethics. Only by one's labor does humanity evolve.

Another element new to the magazine became the frequency with which Hegeler took a personal hand in responding to "letters to the editor," or offered his own editorials separate from Carus. This resulted in a fair number of letters addressed to Hegeler from the magazine's readers and a lively discourse that was exactly what the publisher intended.

Still another change was the decision to bring more European intellectuals into the conversation. Early on, Carus reported that he was in communication with prominent French and German thinkers like

Wilhelm Wundt, Ewald Hering, Ludwig Noire, E. H. L. Steinthal, Carus Sterne, Lazar Geiger, Ernst Haeckel, Alfred Binet, and Théodule-Armand Ribot and offered to publish translations of their writings. True to his promise, he acquired William Preyer's "The Conditions of Life;" Carl Vogt's articles "On Materialism," Karl Theodor Bayrhoffer's "Naturalistic Monism," Max Müller "On the Science of Thought," Ernst Mach's "Transformation and Adaptation in Scientific Thought;" Carus Sterne's "The Animal Soul and the Human Soul;" and Felix L. Oswald's "Body and Mind: or, the Data of Moral Physiology." This became one of the Open Court's greatest accomplishments and quickly raised the magazine's visibility by turning it into a forum for debating some of the more pressing religious, scientific, philosophical, and political issues of the day.

Other changes came on March 8, 1888, with the magazine's transition from a fortnightly to a weekly. Two weeks later, on March 28, Carus married Mary Hegeler, and for the next year, the two lived in Chicago where Carus worked out of the Open Court office on 169-175 La Salle Street at the corner of Monroe. Not until a year later, did they return to La Salle, living in the Hegeler residence and with Carus sharing office space with his father-in-law and other staff on the ground floor while his wife divided her time between M&H ZINC and working as an associate editor for the magazine.

In October 1890, Carus introduced *The Monist,* an erudite quarterly that carried Hegeler's choice title. Articles in *The Monist* tended to be more abstract, including more expansive reviews of books and professional meetings, and even offered a section titled "Literary Correspondence" which provided an expert's overview of developments in philosophy, literature, and education from writers in France, Germany, and Italy. The magazine counted among its contributors an international list of scholars, many of whom wrote for *The Open Court* as well. They included C. Lloyd Morgan and Friedrich Jodl in philosophy; Charles S. Peirce and Ernst Mack in logic, mathematics, and theory of science; August Weismann, Cesare Lombroso, and Joseph LeConte in biology and anthropology; and Frances E. Abbott and Harold Hoeffding in religion and sociology. The difference lay in the level of the magazine's

sophistication, making *The Monist* a precursor to many later disciplinary-based journals.

In what appears to be an unpublished interview of Hegeler found among the Open Court Papers, he admitted to creating the two magazines for the purpose of presenting to the public and to the scientific world "certain religious and philosophical ideas" on which he wanted to invite discussion.

> Foremost among these ideas was that which to me was a solution of the problem of the immortality of the soul. This idea had grown up from certain conclusions as to the nature of the soul, drawn from combining the results of the latest studies in psychology, the nature of language, the latest inventions in the mechanistic world (I think especially of the phonograph), with ideas received from the works of Gustav Freytag, particularly his "Lost Manuscript.' In 1892 just prior to the World's Religious Parliament in Chicago, Dr. Carus found that the ideas set forth in Freytag's works, of which there had been one notable expression in Milton's famous passage on Books; were very similar to the buddhistic view, and so were very old.[4]

Hegeler intended to include in *The Monist* a survey of courses offered in American universities in the departments of Philosophy, Ethics, and Psychology. His purpose was to provide students interested in pursuing studies in these areas with the requisite information to make intelligent choices. However, before the issue was put together, *The American Journal of Psychology* published the information. Notwithstanding his disappointment, Hegeler prepared a breakout of courses at Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Boston University, and five other universities. In doing so, he criticized university registrars for the lack of uniformity in their catalogs and in their programs. In his opinion, this had been caused by the lack of consistency in terminology across institutions; the misguided pretensions of some schools; and the confusion generated by sectarian versus theological vocabulary in the philosophical culture. What made Hegeler's intention so significant was that it represented a continuing

interest on his part to establish a school, college, or institute dedicated to the Religion of Science.[5]

One particularly appealing aspect that Hegeler approved for both magazines was the policy of paying for articles. Checks ranged from $15 per article to as high as $36 for people like Lester Ward, Charles Sanders Peirce¸ Max Müller, and a few others. For most, however, the checks ranged between $15 and $25 and varied by the number of pages. From a cost recovery point of view, this was a poor business decision as it simply added to the annual deficit for each of the magazines. However, Hegeler had no hesitancy in making the decision as it placed both magazines in a comfortable position with respect to their competition.

There is ample evidence, however, that in his role as publisher, Hegeler did not approve of every payment recommended by Carus. One example involved the philosopher and mathematician Charles Sanders Peirce who, having squandered his inheritance by living far beyond his means on an estate inherited from his parents, was known to submit hastily prepared manuscripts in anticipation of receiving a check. Introduced to Carus by Judge Francis C. Russell of Chicago, Peirce submitted literally dozens upon dozens of manuscripts between 1890 and 1913 in hopes of payment. Ultimately Carus published about fourteen of Peirce's articles in the two magazines, for which he provided generous stipends. In early 1893, Peirce visited La Salle to discuss the possibility of writing several math books for the Open Court for which he received a generous advance of over $1,700 in anticipation of their completion.[6]

By August 1894, Peirce's procrastination and failure to deliver what he had agreed, caused Hegeler to cut off further communication with him. Clearly, Hegeler was not fond of Peirce as evidenced in this letter from Carus to Peirce.

> I handed your two letters to Mr. Hegeler and, also informed him of the mss. which you offer for publication, but he said he had no answer to make and did not want to have your mss. accepted. When

> I advised him of the [financial] emergency in which you were at present, he handed me for your immediate need a five-dollar bill which is here enclosed at his request. Under these circumstances I must return your mss. and can do nothing except to hope that you will pull through.[7]

In 1896, Hegeler again refused to pay for one of Peirce's articles, causing Carus to explain to Judge Russell: "Mr. Hegeler remains very reserved, and thought that we should have enough of Peirce for the present with the first article. Thus I fear that I cannot accept it, and certainly I could not accept it for the next number." Not until Hegeler transferred ownership of the Open Court to his daughter Mary in 1902 did Carus feel less constrained to support Peirce's ever-constant requests for advances, but even he eventually soured when Peirce began negotiating with another publisher.[8]

In another instance, where a letter to the editor seemed particularly harsh, Carus's response was enlightening. "Your letter to the Open Court concerning [the sculptress] Elizabeth Ney was received some time ago, and I had it set with the intention of publishing it. Mr. Hegeler, however, thinks it best not to let it appear, unless it be at the direct request of Dr. Edmund Montgomery or his wife [Elizabeth Ney], ... I should not have hesitated to publish your letter, but Mr. Hegeler prefers not to do so lest it may give offense." More sympathetic than his son-in-law, Hegeler felt Montgomery deserved the courtesy, especially since he had been a guest at La Salle in September 1887, leaving everyone with fond memories of his visit.[9]

A wealthy man, Hegeler was forever inundated with individuals seeking his investment in one scheme or another. Frequently, hoping to acquire leverage, some sought out Carus to be a middleman in such requests. Carus would have none of it. Writing to Edgar Ashcroft in April 1906, who was seeking an entrée to present a proposition to his father-in-law, Carus had no qualms in telling Ashcroft that he should present his plan directly to Hegeler, and in the same breadth, to expect no reply.[10]

Multiple Hats

As editor and manager, Carus had an insatiable appetite for words, and in issue after issue, he contributed articles of his own, provided commentary on articles written by others, responded to critiques, wrote book reviews, and answered queries. His editorials covered a wide range of topics, from evolution and Monism, to folklore and the study of Sanskrit. In everything he wrote, he made clear his support of Hegeler's position on agnosticism, monism, immortality, and the Religion of Science.[11]

In a moment of peevishness, Benjamin Underwood, who was now editor of the *Illustrated Graphic News,* accused Carus of changing his opinion from what he had written in *Monism and Meliorism*, particularly "the limits at which our knowledge comes to a stand and where the province of the unknowable commences." Carus did not deny it, admitting that Hegeler had turned his head on a number of matters. At the time he wrote *Monism and Meliorism,* he had not yet freed himself of his metaphysical prejudices. His thoughts on the Unknowable had changed since moving to La Salle where he had the opportunity to read for the first time the works of Ribot and Ewald Hering who had devoted much of their thought to the subject. Now, Carus denied any room for the Unknowable. In fact, reality was identical to knowability. Reality not only implied existence, but its manifestation was itself a recognition that existence and knowability were one and the same. As soon as he understood their full meaning, he admitted to changing from metaphysicism to positivism. Hegeler had, indeed, influenced his thinking.[12]

This view would become even more poignant years later in an article titled "Agnosticism in the Pulpit" which Carus wrote for *The Open Court.*

> We do not deny that there is a certain truth in agnosticism, but it is different from the favorite tenets of the agnostic. It is true that many problems are as yet unsolved, but they are not for that reason

> unsolvable. Much is unknown but nothing is unknowable. Certain things may be unknowable under certain conditions, but only the self-contradictory, only the absurd, is absolutely unknowable. The problems which are unsolvable are illegitimate problems. If we find a problem that cannot be solved, we may be sure that it is wrongly stated and belongs to the category of sham problems. All knowledge is a description of facts and comprehension is due to a correct formulation of groups of facts so that the applicability of the law pervading all becomes apparent. All facts that come within the range of our experience are classifiable and thus they are subject to comprehension.[13]

In the February 2, 1888, issue of *The Open Court,* Hegeler wrote an editorial titled "What the Monistic Religion is to Me. A Letter to a Highly Esteemed New Contributor," in which he explained the essential features of what to him was a religion, namely, that "all that exists, ourselves included, forms a great interacting whole, the most satisfactory name for which to me is the 'All' of which civilized man was its highest phenomenon." The Universe and God were complementary parts that together formed the reality of the All conveying a grander meaning than either the word God or the word Universe when taken separately. Along with Ribot, he believed that man's relation to the All was that of interacting with it in time and space through human consciousness. This formed the basis of ethics inhis religion.[14]

When invited to deliver a speech at the laying of the cornerstone of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at La Salle on August 25, 1889, Hegeler, who presumably had made a generous contribution toward its construction, admitted asking himself if he could in good conscience comply with the request. Although baptized in the Lutheran Church, he had become a stranger to many of its teachings. This included humility which he admitted to having a difficult time following; nor could he accept the value of prayer in so far as it implied supplication. As for Baptism and Holy Communion, both were beautiful customs that implied a brotherhood of believers, but he no longer accepted them. On the other hand, any religion open to the free investigation of the truth could not be opposed to science. In all the great religions, as well as in

the ethical teachings that followed from science, that which was right was the will of God, and that which was wrong was contrary to his will. Common to all was the effort to "find the truth, be it welcome or unwelcome." Assured by the pastor that the Lutheran Church met these conditions, Hegeler accepted the invitation and presented the lecture.[15]

The readership of *The Open Court* felt scandalized by Hegeler's decision, reminding him that "little would be left of the dogmas of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, if science . . . were taken as sole criterion." The fact remained that while Hegeler had voiced laudable motives in accepting the invitation, science and the Church remained opposed to each other, stating that "ecclesiastical dogmas conflict with the method and spirit of scientific research."[16] Another criticism, printed in *The Nation,* accused the publisher of being anti-scientific and anti-philosophical. By its very nature, explained the critic, religion demanded an "unconditional surrender of free-thinking" while science, if true to itself, "cannot listen to such a demand for an instant." Given this understanding, religion and science should each be allowed to seek its own course rather than "forcibly bending them together" in a manner that misrepresented both. Besides, "science is long past caring one fig for the thunder of the theologians."[17] Hegeler responded arguing that conciliating religion and science was neither unscientific nor unphilosophical. Clearly, those ideas which were in conflict with science had to be dropped; irrational faith was never something to be upheld or recommended. Nevertheless, there existed in all religions a power that enforced conduct by man. This, Hegeler emphasized, was better than Spencer's Unknowable from which no ethics could be deduced and why it remained important to work toward a Religion of Science.[18]

Another Masthead

In January 1893, Hegeler and Carus announced another change of wording in *The Open Court's* masthead. Now in its third iteration, it read: "Devoted to the Religion of Science." The change, they explained, was to express in more explicit terms their belief that science was the search for truth using the "best methods of observation and the most rigorous criticism."

> We [Hegeler and Carus] do not preach the religion of science in order to destroy the old religions; we preach it that the old religions may avoid false dogmatism, and that they may adopt the method of science which is a systematic search for truth without reserve and open to criticism. This will widen the narrowest sectarianism into a cosmical religion, as broad as the universe, as reliable as the revelations of God in the book of nature and as sacred as the truths of science. We expect that all the various sects of mankind will by and by acknowledge this principle of the religion of science. Indeed, they will have to! For how can they otherwise stand the bracing air of progress? They need not give up the peculiarities which are not in contradiction to truth. They can, and let us hope they will, preserve their character, their organization, their brotherly love, their zeal for their special tradition and form of religion. Only, let them drop the pagan features of their worship as soon as, in the light of science, they recognize them as pagan.[19]

For both Carus and Hegeler, it was essential that in their investigation of the soul they focus on what the new psychology lent to the effort. They anticipated that such an examination would neither affect the "spirit of religion" nor alter its ethical truths. Instead, it would "place them upon a scientific foundation."

> Since we have gained a scientific insight into the nature of the human soul, the situation is as thoroughly altered as our conception of the universe was in the times when the geocentric standpoint had to be abandoned. The new psychology which may briefly be called the abandonment of the ego-centric standpoint of the soul will influence the religious development of humanity in no less a degree than the new astronomy has done. At first sight the new truths seem appalling. However, a closer acquaintance with the modern solution of the problems of soul-life and especially the problem of immortality shows that, instead of destroying, it will purify religion. The religion of The Open Court is neither exclusive nor sectarian, but liberal; it seeks to aid the efforts of all scientific and progressive people in the churches and out of them, toward greater knowledge of the world in which we live, and the moral

and practical duties it requires. Especial Attention Devoted to Questions of Ethics, Economics, and Sociology. The work of The Open Court has been very successful in this department.[20]

Finance

Besides the medley of book reviews, poetry, correspondence, and articles on religion, philosophy, science, news, and commentary that filled the pages of *The Open Court* and *The Monist,* Hegeler and Carus drew readers into the realms of economics, finance, and politics—all subjects dear to Hegeler. When asked during an interview whether money had any relationship to religion, Hegeler emphatically agreed noting that it was principally in the use of money that an individual formed his predominant attributes of character, reliability, and honesty—attributes he claimed his merchant father had taught him as a young boy in Bremen.

The handling of money was so important, that for purposes of general morality, it could not be ignored. He recalled that Bremen had adopted the gold standard in their dealings with England and other countries. Beyond the city gates, however, the surrounding German territories preferred the use of silver. At the time, the gold coins in circulation were the Louis d'or and Frederick d'or. Believing that the ideal for any government should be the making of moral, intelligent, efficient, and skillful citizens, the question became how best to produce such individuals? Could it happen more easily by instituting a protectionist policy using high tariffs for keeping other nations from competing with American products? Hegeler's answer was an emphatic 'No.' Experience, he insisted, demonstrated that competition was the foundation of progress, and this included competition that gave laborers the right to strike as a method for winning and protecting a respectable standard of living.[21]

Using the zinc industry as a case study, Hegeler noted that its products were currently protected by the imposition of high tariffs. Despite the company's lucrative profits from this legislation, he believed the losers would ultimately be the manufacturers, the mine owners,

and the owners of the mineral land, together with the laborers. Why? Because the policy of protectionism produced a nation of "industrial weaklings" who feared open competition. Only by placing the nation on a free-trade economy would its industries, including zinc, acquire a healthier basis than they now occupied.[22]

As a staunch believer in the gold standard, in June 1896, Hegeler printed "A Petition to the Congress of the United States of America" to enact a statute for the remonetization of silver. The intent of the statute was to ensure the term "dollar," which was based on the value of gold, would not be confused with the coinage of silver.[23] Several issues later, he published in *The Open Court* an article he titled "The Dishonesty of the Coinage Law of 1878" which had made gold and silver a "legal tender at their nominal value for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract." The deception, he explained, had made people erroneously believe that the term "one dollar" implied that gold and silver coins were of equal value when nothing could be more from the truth.[24]

The matter of coinage remained a burning issue for Hegeler, and following William J. Bryan's "Cross of Gold" speech at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago on July 9, 1896, he decided to switch his party affiliation. Writing the lead editorial in *The Open Court,* he admitted having voted for the Democratic ticket ever since the contest between Hancock and Garfield, but now he felt the need to change. Convinced the "main plank of the Democratic party and its allies being one of fraud and dishonor," he felt duty bound to vote against it and to urge others to do the same.[25] He accused the Democrats of attempting to force on the nation the idea that cheap money would benefit the people. "Silver was praised as the money of the poor [while] gold was decried as the instrument by which the toiler is enslaved, and the passions of class hatred were appealed to by unscrupulous demagogues." Such rhetoric was dishonest and he could no abide by it.[26]

Nevertheless, Hegeler insisted that under no circumstances should the gold standard be imposed against the people's will. If the American people voted to switch to a silver standard even though he believed it

would create problems for the business community, the change should be allowed provided that silver money be called something other than ‘dollars. Otherwise, citizens would be tempted to dishonor the honesty and integrity of the nation’s assets.[27] This was vintage Hegeler. “He never did anything for the sake of appearances,” explained his zinc partner, F. W. Matthiessen, “but was always firm for what he believed to be right and was always true to his principles and to his convictions, without regard to financial loss or loss of popularity.” Even though the protective tariff and the gold standard favored his personal interests, he opposed forcing them on the nation if its people chose differently.[28]

Chapter 5

Opinion Makers

Hegeler's preference for independent thinking resulted in the hiring of Matthew Mark Trumbull as a regular contributor to *The Open Court* and *The Monist.* A native of London, he emigrated to Canada in 1846, and a year later, found work in Boston. After enlisting in the U.S. Artillery and fighting in Mexico, he moved to Virginia where he taught school and studied law before going to Iowa where he practiced law and won a seat in the Iowa General Assembly on the Republican ticket. He participated in the Civil War as a captain in the Third Iowa Infantry, was wounded during the Battle of Shiloh, and was discharged as a brevetted brigadier general in 1866. In 1882, he moved to Chicago where he practiced law and authored *The Free Trade Struggle in England* (1895), *Articles and Discussions on the Labor Question* (1894), *Judge Gary and the Anarchists* (1893), and *The Trial of the Judgment: A Review of the Anarchist Case* (1888).[1] Trumbull enjoyed standing apart from his fellow countrymen. "As I am not in good standing with the Republican party, and as the Democratic party is not in good standing with me, I can sit on the fence and listen with luxurious indifference to the pleadings of both sides, and I can laugh with non-partisan impartiality at the calamities of either."[2]And he did just that. He became connected with *The Open Court* during the first year of its existence writing occasional articles for Benjamin Underwood on "The Labor Question." However, under Carus' editorship and encouragement from Hegeler, he became a regular contributor, authoring "Current Topics" using wit, humor, and sarcasm as he pointed to hypocrisy at all levels of government.[3]

"Wheelbarrow"

Trumbull seldom used his real name in his commentaries in *The Open Court*. Instead, he chose "Wheelbarrow" as his byline because he liked to write from the standpoint of a laborer. He chose the term because he had once worked with a pick, shovel, and wheelbarrow as a young man building roadbeds for the railroads.[4] At heart, he was a moderate Republican and therefore inclined to advise the workingman that many popular methods of reform, including Henry George's single tax idea, were harmful and unwise. "The man who thinks that there is a 'sole cause' for all the poverty, vice, misery, errors and mistakes that abound in society," he explained, "may call himself an 'economist,' and a 'student of natural law,' but he has not been much of a 'student' if he has not learned that poverty occasioned by drunkenness, gambling, or even by business imprudence, is not to be removed by levying a tax on land."[5] George's idea, so brilliantly presented in his *Progress and Poverty* (1879), had much truth in its pages but "alas! So much impossible fairyland." Even if land taxation promised all the blessings accorded it by the author, character was what ultimately shaped man's fate. "The most urgent step forwards is the moral elevation of man, and progress is no progress unless it is accompanied by a moral progress of man that makes him stronger and more humane."[6]

So enthusiastic was the debate that followed Wheelbarrow's comments that Carus could only publish a few of the best letters as there were far more than could ever be included in the magazine. The debate over the single-tax theory dominated *The Open Court's* pages for more than a year and would have continued had not Carus decided to halt the discussion as it was consuming too much of the magazine's content. In 1889 alone, nearly fifty letters were published, along with Wheelbarrow's responses.

Strikes

Hegeler respected the right of workers to strike and owners to respond with lockouts. Both were legitimate methods of negotiation provided the strike remained local. On the other hand, when strikes and

lockouts involved outside agitators, sympathetic strikers, mob action, general strikes, and the hiring of private militia, he objected. This was also the opinion of Hegeler's friend and frequent visitor to La Salle, Gustave P. Körner, who had run in the 1872 Illinois gubernatorial election as a candidate of the Liberal Republican Party. Following the Pullman Strike of May 11-July 20, 1894, which severely disrupted rail traffic in the Midwest due to sympathetic strikes that broke out at different times and places, Körner submitted an article for publication in *The Open Court* that recommended holding sympathetic strikers individually responsible if they intruded into localities where the strikes originated. The law, he argued, ought to declare sympathetic strikes a "public offence and the strikers guilty of a misdemeanor, to be punished by fine or imprisonment upon conviction before any competent court."[7] Carus thanked Körner for the article and indicated that his father-in-law would be pleased with it. "I handed it at once to the printers, and you shall have proofs tomorrow or the day after tomorrow. I shall show the article to Mr. Hegeler before it appears, but do not doubt that he agrees with your position."[8]

Haymarket Affair

The Haymarket Affair, otherwise known as the Haymarket Riot, took place in Chicago on May 4, 1886. The day before, during a union rally at the McCormick Harvesting Machine Company to support an eight-hour workday, police intervention caused one person to be killed and several injured. As a protest against police brutality, the union called for a mass gathering the next day at Haymarket Square. The protest proved peaceful enough that the city's mayor, Carter Harrison, attended. Following his departure, however, the police demanded that the crowd disperse and events took a different turn when a bomb was thrown causing the police to respond with gunfire. When it was over, seven policemen were dead, along with a half dozen civilians, and another thirty injured.

In the aftermath of the affair, the newspapers whipped up the public's ire against immigrants and the union, resulting in the arrest of numerous anarchists, eight of whom were convicted on the charge of

murder by conspiring with and abetting an unknown assailant who had thrown the bomb. Ironically, none of the eight was present at the time of the riot and their involvement was never actually proven. Nevertheless, four of the defendants were hanged on November 11, 1887. Writing in *The Open Court* in 1888, Hegeler's attorney, Charles K. Whipple, decried the hangings, claiming their execution was not only a fault but a blunder.[9] Unconvinced of their guilt, Carus sent Cesare Lombroso forty-three photographs of the anarchists who the Chicago police had rounded up and asked for his assessment of their physiognomy. According to the criminologist, 40% of the men in the photographs had characteristics similar to the 'criminal type.' In fact, Lombroso considered them all an anomaly, which is to say their ears were without lobes; their jaws were much developed; and all bore full foreheads, a telltale sign of social deviance.[10] In September 1890, Carus visited the Joliet penitentiary where he met the anarchists Michael Schwab and Oscar Neebe. He soon joined a chorus of advocates supporting efforts to obtain their pardon. He called their convictions "an act of lawlessness" and a "violation of the most sacred rights of the citizens of all civilized countries." Their convictions, he argued, would have been impossible in England, France, and Germany, since its judges were independent of the government.[11]

In 1893, Governor Peter Altgeld received petitions from Clarence Darrow and other criminal attorneys requesting clemency for the prisoners. Eventually, Altgeld concluded that the defendants had not been given a fair trial due to a biased judge and jury and issued pardons, an action that was widely condemned by the conservative press and the business community.

Homestead Strike

The Homestead strike in July 1892 resulted from a labor dispute between the Carnegie Steel Company and its workers when Henry Clay Frick, the executive of Carnegie Steel, announced the company's decision to cut workers' wages at the plant near Pittsburgh. When Frick refused to negotiate the decision with the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers and instituted a lockout on June 29, it led to a strike on July 1 that culminated on July 6 in a pitched battle between

the strikers and 300 Pinkerton agents hired by the company as security guards arrived in barges along the riverfront. When the workers tried to prevent the Pinkertons from coming ashore, the groups fired on each other. Before the Pinkertons surrendered, twelve people were dead, and several Pinkertons were beaten after they surrendered. Frick requested and received aid from the governor who sent 8,500 National Guardsmen to secure the mill and place the town under martial law. By mid-August, the mill resumed operations with the help of 1,700 strikebreakers, including the first Black steelworkers. When the striking workers returned to their jobs in October, their leaders were arrested and charged with murder and other crimes. Although none were convicted, the debacle destroyed the union while the company proceeded to reduce wages, implement a twelve-hour workday, and cut hundreds of jobs.[12]

Wheelbarrow took exception to the crassness of the company's actions and its aftermath, criticizing Andrew Carnegie and Frick for using Pinkerton detectives without good reason. In particular, he poked the nose of Pennsylvania Governor Robert E. Pattison who had complimented the militia for their "zeal and activity" in reducing the strikers to "peace and submission." Wheelbarrow responded:

> These are portentous words; ominous, not only to the working men but also to their masters. When I remember that the most productive estate of its size in all this world, is the piece of land geographically known as Pennsylvania, it seems to me that if a standing army becomes necessary there to dragoon the working men into "peace and submission," something must be wrong in the management of that farm. "Peace and submission" is an irritating phrase when directed exclusively against the working men, for it implies that the laborers are a conquered class; and a conquered class is a rickety foundation on which to build the prosperity of any nation; because men, and especially American men, will never contentedly stay conquered.[13]

Hegeler generally agreed with Trumbull but, in this instance, felt that he had been overly hasty in his condemnation of Carnegie's decision to use his wealth to buy political favors. Hegeler found nothing

wrong in the practice and admitted he had often done the same. A better solution would have been to use a 'court of arbitration' whose members were nominated by both sides. If implemented, such courts could be guided in their decisions by whether the wages paid to the workers were fair in relation to the cost of living and to comparable trades. If the manufacturer refused to accept the court's decision, the company could face daily fines that could be used to the support striking workers and their families. If, on the other hand, the strikers refused to accept the court's decision, the state could intervene on behalf of the company to protect its hiring of any new employees. And if both sides refused to accept the court's decision, the strike or lockout could continue but without any outside support to either side.[14]

Coxey's Army

When, in March 1894, Ohio businessman Jacob Coxey organized a ragtag group of unemployed workers to march from Massillon, Ohio, to Washington D.C., the prospect of it ever being realized drew national attention. Considered the first significant protest march on the nation's capital, Coxey's Army protested the high rate of unemployment, lobbied for an expanded paper currency, and urged the government to invest in public works as a way to offset the effects of the Panic of 1893 and the economic depression then in its second year. When the army passed through Pittsburgh, Becks Run, and Homestead in April, it numbered about three hundred men.

Initially, Wheelbarrow gave little thought to the Coxey's Army and predicted it would "straggle out of existence" before ever reaching Washington. He was wrong. As General Coxey and his army of unemployed came within sight of Pittsburgh, officials banned the marchers from participating in a public parade through the city and barred local residents from visiting their camp. Instead the army was corralled into a local ballpark where they were penned up like cattle. Although the leaders met each new demand of the police, news spread that the men were being arrested, imprisoned, and punished with fines for acting "in anarchistic defiance" of the Constitution. Wheelbarrow

strenuously objected, claiming "It was drawing another deadline between the classes and the masses, between the rich and the poor." Not only were the actions of the police unnecessary, they represented a burlesque "exercise of bludgeon power, adding another contribution to that threatening mass of discontent which is already too large for the peace and safety of the republic."[15]

Evolution and Race

Although the evidence supporting evolution proved overwhelming by the 1880s and 1890s, a number of zoologists, entomologists, and paleontologists questioned whether Darwin's theory of natural selection adequately explained the actual process of evolution or were other options equally relevant. A number of American scientists, many of whom were former students of Louis Agassiz, advocated for the law of "acceleration and retardation."[16] This latter school of thought, which published many of its views in the *American Naturalist,* formed around the research of Edward Drinker Cope (1840-1897), Alpheus Spring Packard (1839-1905), and Alpheus Hyatt (1838-1902). Known as the "American School," they used the term Neo-Lamarckism to clarify their position.[17]

In many ways, the zoologist and paleontologist Edward D. Cope stood out as the most vocal supporter of Neo-Lamarckism. An avid student of Dr. Joseph Leidy at the University of Pennsylvania, his family sent him to Europe during the Civil War to continue his studies; on his return, he accepted a chair of comparative zoology and botany at Haverford College. In 1887, he became editor-in-chief of the *American Naturalist* which he used to whittle away at the Darwin's theory through a multitude of articles on subjects ranging from mollusks to man.[18] Despite his Quaker background as a member of the Pennsylvania Society of Friends, he had a pugnacious disposition which, on occasion, led to violent quarrels. Once, in the corridors of the American Philosophical Society, an academic argument with Persifor Frazer, a specialist in handwriting, fraud, and forgery, culminated in a frenzied fistfight.[19]

Preeminent among his many articles in *The Open Court* were his explanations for race development and capacity. Like John Fiske and Herbert Spencer, who had argued a direct relationship between mental mass and intelligence, Cope noted that "every peculiarity of the body has probably some corresponding significance in the mind, and the cause of the former are the remoter causes of the latter."[20] He went on to explain "the existence of higher and lower races, the latter being those which we now find to present greater or less approximation to the apes." While some of these physiological characteristics were observable in certain "immature stages of the Indo-European race," most notably among the Irish and Slavic peoples, they were most obvious in the Negro.[21]

In a series of articles that began in 1888 and continued into the early 1890s in *The Open Court,* Cope spoke out openly against the Negro, advocating for both his disfranchisement and forced migration from the United States. The inferior character of the Negro mind in the scale of evolution had made him unfit for American citizenship. Lacking sufficient standards of rationality and morality, his organic constitution resembled incomplete development, the result of an acceleration and retardation process remote from the evolution of the Caucasian. Unlike the superior races, the Negro no longer existed in an evolutionary schema. His physical development exhibited such a predominance of quadrumanous features as to preclude further mental growth. Having experienced the same amount of time as all other races to advance his status through education, the Negro had neither "improved it, nor been improved by it." As a consequence, the Negro mind had undergone "more or less an eclipse."[22]

Given what he believed was the race's inferior status to most other peoples, Cope argued that it was political suicide to permit Negroes to utilize their million or more votes in the American electoral system as it opened the ballot box to demagogues who would appeal to their superstitions with results that he warned would have enormous ramifications on the body politic.[23] For that reason, the nation needed an amendment to narrow voting rights along with a more restrictive immigration bill that would ensure the safety of the nation's republican institutions. America's democracy depended upon the high moral and

physical character of its people. If they lost the superior intelligence needed to govern through miscegenation or loss of voting power, the government would likely turn to militarism. The franchise, therefore, ought to be guarded not only from the Negro race but from the "half-civilized hordes" arriving daily from southern and eastern Europe.[24]

Above all else, Cope warned against the contamination of the Caucasian race by the supporters of miscegenation and reminded readers that race mixture would ultimately cause a deterioration in the intellectual, moral, and political fiber of the nation. For that reason, he favored the bill of Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama which sought "to draw the lines of political separation as clear and as deep as is the line of racial distinction between them." Morgan urged the United States to re-examine the Negro's qualifications to suffrage, control the privilege of voting, and secure, if possible, a "happy home" in the Philippine Archipelago "to which [Negroes] would flock with rejoicings and grow into power beneath our flag."[25]

Cope concurred. The form of government adopted by the American people which granted enormous amounts of personal liberty, had become dangerous due to those inferior races that were unable to sustain a balance between order and freedom. The Negro, more so than any other race, failed in all forms of government. The Negro's dilemma was all the more difficult because he had to compete with the Caucasian, the most evolved of the races of man. The African, despite his preference for remaining in America, ought to be removed to some other home. "We cannot take the risk of his presence here. Let him work out his own salvation without risking the future of the Indo-European. If he is as capable as some persons believe, it will do him no harm. If he succeeds no better in the future than he has in the past, he will not surprise some who think they know him better."[26]

Cope's recommendation that the African Americans be returned to Africa or elsewhere unleashed a storm of letters arguing both sides of the issue.[27] To be sure, it was not the magazine's finest hour as Hegeler and Carus allowed Cope and his sympathizers to spew their ideas across

multiple issues. Despite devastating critiques Cope remained adamant in his position.

> I repeat again what appear to me to be the facts of the case. The characteristics of the negro-mind are of such a nature as to unfit him for citizenship in this country. He is thoroughly superstitious, and absolutely under the control of supernaturalism, in some generally degrading form, and the teachers of it. He is lacking in rationality and in morality. Without going further, these traits alone should exclude him from citizenship. Secondly, these peculiarities depend on an organic constitution which it will require ages to remove. Corresponding qualities in the lower strata of the white race, are modified or removed in a comparatively short time, on account of superior natural mental endowment. Thirdly, if he remains in this country he will mix with the whites until in a half century or less, there will not be a person of pure negro blood in it. It follows from this that there will be, in accordance with the usual rate of increase, an immense population of mulattoes, where there should be an equal number of whites. The deterioration thus resulting would tell disastrously on our intellectual and moral, and consequently on our political, prosperity.[28]

For most subscribers to *The Open Court* and *The Monist,* many of whom were among the nation's most educated and prominent intellectuals, the concept of race inferiority was beyond critical reach. Most white Americans were confident in their future and convinced that the nation's treatment of the Negro represented a case study in misapplied philanthropy. As a consequence, they showed a willingness to place sanctions on their freedoms along with equal numbers of exclusionary sanctions on the waves of immigrants arriving daily from southern and eastern Europe. To be sure, there was neither concealment nor delicacy in these beliefs. What differences that did exist, applied largely to the consequences of those beliefs, not the beliefs themselves. H. F. Kletzing and W. H. Crogman, authors of *Progress of a Race* (1898), seemed to speak for most white Americans at the time when they argued that the Negro race had either to "keep up the procession, or else . . . it had to get out of the way." The world was moving too fast and the Negroes

in America had to face it.[29] With the intellectual leadership in both the United States and Europe, not to mention Japan, having accepted science as the supreme arbiter of truth, society betrayed no sentiment, popular or otherwise, to consider a redefinition of its racial beliefs. Not until late 1901 did Carus quit publishing letters on the subject.[30]

* * *

In the meantime, large sections of history slipped by before a hesitant few questioned society's treatment of the Negro. Even then, the systemic acceptance of race inferiority remained outside the framework of discussion. Race inferiority lay at the very foundation of the evolutionary synthesis and rose to the pinnacle of "truth" on the coattails of the myth of scientific certainty. In this regard, Carus and Hegeler were unfortunately no different from their peers, the evidence of which existed in the many articles and discussions that filled the pages of *The Open Court* and *The Monist.* Although neither the publisher nor the editor was reticent in commenting on the views put forward by their authors, in this instance they chose to remain silent regarding Cope's solution to the 'Negro Problem' as it seemed to fit within their framework of acceptable options. As evidence of this, when Hegeler fired the business manager of the Open Court's Chicago office in 1909, Carus unknowingly hired an African American (Mr. Snow) who had 'passed' as white. After learning of his racial background, the man was forced to resign, and Catherine Cook, the former secretary to the manager, took his place.[31]

To understand Carus's reasoning for the above action, it is worthwhile reading a letter from Carus dated June 17, 1911, to Felix Orman, a Jewish job applicant who accused the editor of dismissing his inquiry regarding potential employment with the Open Court because he was Jewish. Carus confessed to Orman that he did exhibit race prejudice, but that it did not include Jews. "I have race prejudice against the negro [sic]," he wrote, "and think that all the races have their distinct characteristics which fit them for special work in a special line, and disqualify them for others."[32] In another instance, in a letter to Tan Tek Soon of Singapore, he wrote: "I believe sincerely that the Negro has

his best chances in the United States; he has the ballot and can vote; he is before the law equal to the white man, and if he is as yet incapable of being actually an equal to the white man it is to a great extent due to the inferiority of the race."[33] With these words, Carus not only justified in his mind the replacement of the manager of the Open Court's Chicago office, but reflected the mind-set of most white Americans of his generation. Even given its most benign of interpretations, Carus' opinion reflected a systemic view toward race and race capacity that has forever stained the nation's psyche.

Chapter 6

The Parliament of Religions

Before 1893, the pages of *The Open Court* and *The Monist* did not lack references to Eastern philosophies and religions. Carus's own *Lieder eines Buddhisten* (*Songs of a Buddhist*), which he published in 1882, could be traced back to the influence of his gymnasium tutor and Indologist, Hermann Grassmann. Carus also recalled meeting a Buddhist high priest in the 1870s when he was still living in Germany. The priest had been sent by the Japanese government to study Western religions and had mentioned reading two of Carus's publications which he considered worthy of notice because they referred to beliefs similar to his own. It struck Carus that, like himself, the priest had been well-versed in the writings of Plato and Kant.[1] All of which is to say that Carus, more so than Hegeler, was drawn to Buddhist and Hindu philosophies through multiple portals including Eugene Burnouf's *Introduction a'L'histoire du Bouddhisme indien* (1844); Arthur Schopenhauer's *The World as Will and Representation* (1818); August Wilhelm Schlegel's editing of the *Bhagavad-Gita* and the Sanskrit poem the *Ramayana*; Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust* (1808); and Hermann Oldenberg's popular *Buddha. His Life, His Doctrine, His Order* (1881). He also found considerable similarity between Christian and Buddhist sentiments as expressed in their hymns and poetry.[2] Carus was particularly fond of Goethe's views on Buddhism who treated it as a religion and recognized no other revelation except truth proven by science. He considered "Buddha and Goethe are nearer to the spirit of Christ than those who bear his name and call themselves his disciples.[3]

Pre-1893

The earliest article of any significance on Buddhism in *The Open Court* was General J. G. R. Forlong's three-part series in 1887 titled "Through What Historical Channels Did Buddhism Influence Early Christianity." A scholarly study, it offered evidence of Buddhist missionary work in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. Perhaps the earliest of the missionary faiths, Buddhist monks carried their message to the Therapeuts in 200 B.C., the Essenes in 150 B.C., the so-called Baptizers of the Euphrates and the Jordan, and finally the Manicheans in the ancient Iranian city of Ctesiphon on the eastern bank of the Tigris, southeast of present-day Baghdad. According to Forlong, Buddhists had ample time to fulfill their missionary obligations, namely, that "all must preach what the master taught that whoso hides his faith shall be struck with blindness." To whoever would listen, they preached that the world was but a passing show in which each individual should try to help his fellow man and should ponder less upon the gods and more on the gospel of usefulness.[4]

In April 1889, the magazine published Hermann Oldenberg's "The Discovery of the Veda,"[5] followed a month later with his "The History of the Vedic Epoch."[6] In 1890, three years before the Parliament of Religion, *The Open Court* announced receiving works in the English language classed under the philosophy of the Vedanta and available through the Vedanta Publishing House in Calcutta, India. They included *A Manual of Adwaita Philosophy: The Vedantasara*, translated from the Sanskrit by Dr. Nandalal Dhole; *The Vicharsagar; or Metaphysics of the Upanishads*, translated into English by Lala Sree-ram Sahib; *The Panchadasi. a Handbook of Hindu Pantheism*, translated by Dr. Nandalal Dhole; *Shiva Sanhita. The Esoteric Science and Philosophy of the Taiitras* translated by Babu Srish Chunder Vasu; and *On the Road to Self-Knowledge*, translated by Ainritalal Basil.[7] Also in 1890, the magazine published an article by A. H. Gunlogsen titled "The Philosophy of the Vedanta" which examined the religious and philosophical systems of ancient India, the rise of Buddhism in the sixth century before Christ, and the "extravagant" hybrid known as Theosophy associated with Olcott and Blavatsky. These were followed in 1892 with an article by

H. H. Williams on "The Psychology of Buddhism," and a lengthy series titled "The Redemption of Brahman" by Richard Garbe.

Carus understood Buddhism to mean that the world of the senses resembled a "veil upon our eyes." Buddha, meaning the enlightened one, taught that by understanding the truth or enlightenment, one could abandon the illusion. The highest stage of Buddhist perfection, Nirvana, implied extinction and was obtained by extinguishing the "we," the "I," and the "ego." Nirvana represented a higher reality when "the life of the universe began to live in us" and we became "stewards of cosmic existence." Nevertheless, Carus viewed Buddhism as a religion of pessimism and apathy. He claimed to have found this in many of its writings and concluded that, as practiced in the East, Buddhism "produced the most fatal effects of indifference and retrogression upon those races that embraced its faith.[8]

Congress of Religions

In 1893, the year the country faced the worst financial crisis in its history until then, the World's Fair, also known as the Columbian Exposition, celebrated the four-hundredth anniversary of Christopher Columbus's discovery of the New World. In its 184 days of existence, from May 1 through October 30, twenty-eight million visitors, the equivalent of one-third of the American population, attended the Fair, each paying an entry fee of fifty cents to enjoy the exhibits spread over its six-hundred-acre site located on the southern shores of Lake Michigan. Known as the "White City" because of its white stucco buildings and the extensive use of electric street lights to showcase its grandeur in the night sky, the Fair offered a snapshot of America's coming-of-age, with products ranging from Quaker Oats to Edison's moving-picture Kinetograph. The White City stood next door to the raucous energy of Chicago, a city that had rebuilt itself after the Great Fire of 1871 and was now home to Philip Armour, Gustavus Swift, Alvah Roebuck, Richard Sears, Aaron Montgomery Ward, Marshall Field, and Cyrus H. McCormick. White city represented an idealized version of Chicago—a contrast to the world's primitive cultures, whose huts and peculiar customs were also on display. The city, a theatrical illusion of the most

Americanized of American cities, celebrated the industrialized West's triumphal accomplishments in transportation, electricity, architecture, and manufacturing amid the shadows of poverty, saloons, brothels, illiteracy, strikes, lockouts, and class conflict.[9]

Not all of what the Fair's visitors saw was real. Upsetting to M. M. Trumbull was a pamphlet he received titled *The Reason Why the Colored American was not in the World's Columbian Exposition* compiled by Ida B. Wells-Barnett. In it, Frederick Douglas, who wrote the introduction, made a plaintive appeal to the American conscience to recognize the contributions of the Negro. Instead, there were none. More to the point, the African American seemed not to exist. The reality of slavery, lynchings, chain gangs, and systemic persecution were all matters conspicuously hidden from sight to insure visitors a harmonious experience. Although the Negro paid his share of tax money to provide for the Exhibition, he was denied a place in its history, a decision that only diminished the Fair's significance to those with a social conscience. "The spirit of cast excluded the colored people, and the only right allowed them was the privilege of paying fifty cents to see the show."[10]

Accompanying the Fair was the World's Congress Auxiliary, the result of a proposal put forth by Chicago attorney and Judge, Charles Carroll Bonney (1831-1903) who, in an article published in *The Statesman* magazine in October 1889, suggested that besides celebrating the world's material triumphs, equal importance should be given to recognizing the achievements of humankind in religion, art, and philosophy. A native of New York, Bonney had been educated by private tutors before attending Hamilton Academy and Colgate University where he earned the Doctor of Laws. Within a few years, he became one of the top Western jurists serving as a counselor to the Supreme Court of the United States, president of the Illinois State Bar Association, and vice president of the American Bar Association. Reform-minded, he advocated for a national banking system, national regulation of interstate commerce, the creation of a national civil service academy, a system of civil service pensions, state boards of labor and capital, and a permanent international court of justice. He would soon become a friend and colleague to both Hegeler and Carus.

With public support for Bonney's proposal, including a ringing endorsement from President Benjamin Harrison and the U.S. Congress, the Exposition's president, Lyman J. Gage, appointed him to preside over a World's Congress Auxiliary with the goal to expand the Exposition's celebration of humanity's many accomplishments. By the time the Fair opened, Bonney had organized twenty congresses addressing Women's Progress, Public Press, Medicine and Surgery, Temperance, Moral and Social Reform, Commerce and Finance, Social and Economic Science, Music, Literature, Education, Engineering, Art, Government, Science, Philosophy, Labor, Religion, Sunday Rest, Public Health, and Agriculture. Because of the large numbers of interested parties, each of the congresses and their subsets met for periods ranging from a day to two weeks over the six-month period of the Exposition's existence. The Auxiliary's planning involved 210 working committees with a local membership of 1,600 and a non-resident membership of over 15,000. When finally completed, a total of 1,245 sessions were held and 5,974 speakers read papers before nearly three quarters of a million listeners.[11]

Of all the two-hundred congresses that met during the Exposition, Bonney paid special attention to forming a World's Congress (Parliament) of Religions. As a member of the Swedenborgian Church of the New Jerusalem, he enjoyed learning about the different views held between and among the Christian denominations and had shown the same curiosity for the major religions of the world. Wishing to share that experience with his fellow countrymen, he appointed 46-year-old Rev. John Henry Barrows (1847-1902), pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago to chair the Parliament's planning committee. The intent behind it was not unlike the organizers of the Exposition in that, beneath the placid display of benevolence, its members reflected the Eurocentric values of Anglo-Protestant Christianity which they felt stood at the apex of the world's religions, a shining example of the new world order and of social Darwinism's survival of the fittest. Christianity was destined to become the final religion of humankind. Accordingly, the committee's list of subjects for discussion included revelation, immortality, the incarnation of God, the universal elements in religion, the ethical unity of different religious systems, and the

relation of religion to morals, marriage, education, science, philosophy, evolution, music, labor, government, peace, and war.[12]

Those religions invited to send delegates included Theism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Zoroastrianism, Catholicism, the Greek and Russian Orthodoxy, Theosophy, Christian Science, and Protestantism in its many forms, including Congregational, Methodist, Lutheran, Universalism, the Church of the New Jerusalem, YMCA, YWCA, and the Evangelical Alliance. Absent were the Mormons, Sikhs, and the Native American tribes, and only Bishops Daniel Alexander Payne and Benjamin William Arnett of the African Methodist Episcopal Church were invited to represent the African-American contributions to the Protestant mainstream. Eventually some forty-one denominational and inter-denominational conventions participated. The committee's invitation stated that the purpose was "not to denounce but to announce, not to debate but to confer, not to decree but to consult." In addition, it proposed that "the speakers will . . . state their own beliefs and reasons for them with the greatest frankness, without however employing unfriendly criticism of other faiths."[13]

The responses to the committee's invitation resonated with most, but not all. Some religious leaders could not abide the idea of sharing the platform with so-called infidels. The Rev. E. W. Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, opted to keep the Church of England from participating in the Parliament. He could not understand how Christians could be party to it "without assuming the equality of the other intended members."[14] Others, like Rev. E. J. Eitel of Hong Kong, refused on grounds that the Parliament represented an unconscious treason against Christ and warned Barrows that he was endangering "the precious life of [his] soul by playing fast and loose with the truth and coquetting with false religions."[15] Much to Barrows' surprise, however, the committee secured the support of Archbishop James C. Gibbons of Baltimore, Archbishop Patrick Feehan of Chicago, Bishop and Rector John Joseph Keane of Catholic University, and Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minnesota. To be clear, it was the American Catholic Church, and not the European Church, that supported participation.

Despite its approval, the American Catholic hierarchy had its own special way of addressing the pluralism of religions. Rather than voice their alarm at what they believed was a meeting of pagans destined for divine damnation, they displayed placards at locations in the Art Palace where the Parliament's various symposia met, advising Catholic visitors that if they had questions regarding their faith, they would be answered in a special room set aside for that purpose. There, Catholics huddled around priests who, like army sergeants, turned every concern into something positive.[16]

Heavy-Handed Beliefs

The decision to keep the World's Fair (and by implication, all twenty congresses) open on Sundays caused a revolt among the American clergy who called the Fair's organizers "anarchists" in their defiance of God's law and predicted that cyclones and cholera would rain down on the events. One particular clergyman compared the decision to an "act of secession" and declared that "any party opposing the Sunday closing was a foe of the nation." Responding with his usual dry wit, Matthew M. Trumbull ("Wheelbarrow") used the pages of *The Open Court* and *The Monist* to criticize the clergy's remarks as demonstrating "alarming symptoms of theological hydrophobia." Besides testing the forbearance of the Almighty for not "showing his vengeance upon Chicago as he did upon the disobedient cities mentioned in the Bible," he wondered why God's fury had resulted in so many Sundays with "exceedingly fine" weather.[17]

The Parliament opened on September 11 with four thousand delegates and visitors in attendance at Columbus Hall. Following the singing of John Wesley's One Hundredth Psalm, Archbishop Gibbons led the delegates and guests in reciting the "Lord's Prayer" which Bonney designated as the "Universal Prayer." Bonney then thanked all for participating and asked them to rejoice in this "glorious day." Next in the welcoming, John Barrows predicted that "The Parliament is likely to prove a blessing to many Christians by marking the time when they shall cease thinking that the verities and virtues of other religions

discredit the claims of Christianity or bar its progress." He made the point of stressing that the word religion meant "the love and worship of God and the love and service of man," and expressed his hope that the temper of love would prevail over the next two weeks. "We are not here as Baptists and Buddhists, Catholics and Confucians, Parsees and Presbyterians, Methodists and Moslems; we are here as members of a Parliament of Religions, over which flies no sectarian flag . . . but where for the first time in a large council is lifted up the banner of love, fellowship, and brotherhood."[18]

By all appearances, the Christian delegates wished to have both the first and last word at the ceremonies. Not only were the sessions opened with the recitation of the Lord's Prayer, but in his welcoming remarks to the assembled delegates at its first session, Archbishop Gibbons felt obliged to state that "in my duty as a minister of the Catholic Church if I did not say that it is our desire to present the claims of the Catholic Church to the observation and, if possible, to the acceptance of every right-minded man that will listen to us."[19] Gibbons was followed by German Count A. Bernstorff who, speaking on behalf of Evangelical Protestantism, noted: "I should never have set my foot in this Parliament if I thought that it signified anything like a consent that all religions are equal and that it is only necessary to be sincere and upright . . . . I believe only the Bible to be true and Protestant Christianity the only true Religion. I wish no compromise of any kind."[20]

In the meetings that assembled over the following two weeks, the terms "science" and "evolution" were repeated over and over in speeches and conversations. By making frequent references to the law of evolution, the Judeo-Christian delegates staked their claim to Christianity's growing significance in the modern world. As Scottish evangelist Henry Drummond explained, "Evolution and Christianity have the same Author, the same end, the same spirit . . . Christianity is the Further Evolution."[21]

The delegates from the East were no less emphatic in making their case for science and evolution. Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902), a Hindu monk and native of Calcutta who later became India's spiritual

ambassador to the West, gave several presentations before packed audiences where he placed Hinduism on equal footing with the Western religious traditions of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism. He also pointed out the contradictions of the West and of Christianity in such a way as to capture the impulses of guilt stemming from the West's missionary fervor to change hearts and minds while indifferent to peoples' poverty. A disciple of Ramakrishna, he affirmed Hinduism as one of the most ancient and modern of religions serving all classes of people. He legitimized Hinduism—both its antiquity and modernity—for Western audiences with a choice of language that, as explained by Kay Koppendrayer, fit nicely into the vocabulary of his Western audience.

> [Vivekananda reminded] his audience that even before Newtonian thought 'discovered' the law of gravity, it existed, implying through this juxtaposition of words, that Vedic thought had much earlier captured what Western science only later recognized. The Western post-Enlightenment endeavor, that seeks to understand through verifiable observation the laws of the natural world, [had] already been anticipated by Vedic thought . . . . Here, Vivekananda [was] also implying that the fundamental configuration of Hindu thought is empirical, even if that has gone unrecognized, and that there is no difference between Hindu religious thought and scientific thought, except, perhaps, that Hindu science developed first.[22]

Another, Anagarika Dharmapala (1864-1933), a popular Buddhist layman from Ceylon and Secretary of the Maha-Bodhi Society, chose his words with a clear understanding of how they would resonate with his Western audience, focusing on the terms "evolution" and "cause and effect" because they were at the center of most discussions. Buddhism, he explained to his largely supportive audiences, was consistent with Western science and in step with the most recent theories of evolution. Buddhism might be 2,400 years old, but it was as relevant today as it was then. After the close of the Parliament, Dharmapala traveled widely through the United States, joining Henry Steel Olcott and the Theosophists in preaching against the influence of Christian missionary schools.[23]

Despite the dogmatic and aggressive clergymen from the western world, Dharmapala's comments forced most Christian delegates to their best behavior when he compared the actions of Christian and Buddhist missionaries. As he observed:

> The [Christian] missionaries sent to Ceylon, China, or Burmah, as a rule, have not the toleration that we need. The missionary is intolerant, he is selfish. Why do not the natives take to him? Because he has not the toleration and unselfishness he should have. Who are his converts? They are all men of low type. Seeing the selfishness and intolerance of the missionary not an intelligent man will accept Christianity. Buddhism bad its missionaries before Christianity was preached. It conquered all Asia, and made the Mongolians mild. Its preachers do not go in this grand, fashionable costume of yours, but in the simple garb you see upon this platform. They did not go with a Bible in one hand and a rum bottle in the other; but they went full of love and compassion and sympathy. With these attributes they conquered; and they made Asia mild. Slaughter-houses were abolished; public houses were abolished, but they are now on the increase because of the influence of Western civilization. . . . Let the missionaries study all the religions; let them be a type of meekness and lowliness and they will find a welcome in all lands."[24]

The Japanese Buddhists were no less persuasive as they sought to offset the hegemonic biases of the Western delegates. Presentations from Yatsubuchi Banryu, Toki Horin, Ashitsu Jitsunen, Kinza Hirai, and Shaku Soyen, Lord Abbot of Engakuji, made clear not only their disapproval of the injustices committed against Japanese migrants to the United States, the prohibition against the access of Japanese children to public schooling, but Christianity's serious and unmistakable misunderstandings of their beliefs.[25]

Carus, who had been appointed secretary to Bonney's World's Congress Auxiliary, and also served as a member of the Advisory Council to the Religious Congress, spent months prior to the opening of the Parliament attending meetings in Chicago and corresponding

with fellow committee members regarding their plans. So committed had he become to the work of the Auxiliary that he attended forty-six of the congresses and presented lectures at three of them. He gave his first, "The Philosophy of the Tool" before the Congress of Manual and Art Education in July.[26] On August 24, he delivered his second address titled "Our Need for Philosophy" before the Congress of Science and Philosophy.[27] And on September 20, before a symposium on the relationship between Religion and Science, he delivered "Religion and its Relation to the Natural Sciences." In it, he argued that many of the theological questions of past ages had disappeared, but religion had not ceased to be a factor in man's evolution. Because of religion's historical influence over man's conduct, it was bound to advance to a purer conception as it grew closer to science. There being only one truth, the nature of religious truth was the same as scientific truth. Only through science could religion acquire its truths. "Religion is as indestructible as science; for science is the method of searching for the truth, and religion is the enthusiasm and goodwill to live a life of truth."[28]

Outcomes

Most of the delegates were pleased with the outcome of the Parliament. Those from Asia, many of whom had been 'westernized' by prior visits, felt comfortable lecturing to American audiences. As young reformers (Dharmapala 29; Vivekananda 30; and Shaku Soyen 34) in their homeland, they were anxious to express themselves and spread their influence abroad. The United States offered both money and opportunity to initiate what could be identified as a reverse missionary movement, seizing the opportunity to go on lecture tours, and speak at places like the Concord School or the Green Acre experiment of Sarah Jane Farmer in Maine. While Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch spoke of the approaching goal of religious unity in his closing remarks,[29] Barrows announced that the Parliament "widened the bounds of human fraternity," clarified the nature of the non-Christian faiths, and brought back to the human mind "the greater world of the Spirit." So important were its effects, that it earned an "enduring place in human history as an imperishable part of the progress of mankind."[30]

Initially, "Wheelbarrow" viewed the Parliament with skepticism and enjoyed poking fun at the reaction of church leaders to the decision to keep the Exposition open on Sundays. He even predicted their search for common ground would end in failure. "I am afraid that every delegate will go home as rigidly orthodox as he came, convinced that all the others belong to a stiff-necked and rebellious generation." Exemplary of this, when several Buddhist priests visited a local Presbyterian service, its minister, after extending a warm welcome to his guests, proceeded with chivalrous politeness to tell them that "the countries in which their religion reposes are those in which human progress lies wrinkled like an ancient parchment."[31]

By the time the Parliament closed, "Wheelbarrow" was praising its spirit of tolerance which he attributed to Barrows whose dignified manner and eloquent words reflected a man "of rare tact and executive ability."[32] Having changed his opinion, he looked forward to the adoption of "a broad cosmic religion . . . containing less myth and more truth, less creed and more deed, less dogma and more proof." As he explained: "The Parliament provided a sort of intellectual crucible in which all the creeds will be tested and purified as by fire. That sectarians of a hundred theologies have brought them to the furnace is a sign of social progress, and a promise of larger toleration. He who fears the fire has no faith, for whatsoever is true in his religion will come out of the furnace as pure metal, leaving the dross to be thrown away."[33]

Months later, when queries were sent to the attendees who were asked to evaluate the event, the responses revealed a range of differences—from total support to indifference and negativity. Although the Zen monk Shaku Soyen reported positively of the event to Barrows, in a later statement intended only for his countrymen, he characterized the Parliament as having been convened "because the Western nations have come to realize the weaknesses and the folly of Christianity." Unlike their intent which had been to demonstrate the wisdom and justice for the conversion of heathens, the Parliament had demonstrated instead the failure of Christianity in the East and perhaps the possibility that the West had outgrown its own religion. The Buddhist delegates, Soyen explained, left with the opinion that

Christianity was "more a fashion than a faith, a formalism destitute of soul." Like incense, "it gives an odor of sanctity to pleasure, and after we have indulged in self-worship for a life-time, it blesses us with absolution for our sins." For that and other reasons, many Buddhist and Hindu delegates believed that America had become a fertile ground for their own missionary work. Again, quoting Soyen, "The meetings showed the great superiority of Buddhism over Christianity and the mere fact of calling the meetings showed that the Americans and other Western peoples had lost their faith in Christianity and were ready to accept the teachings of our superior religion.[34]

La Salle's Visitors

During the two weeks of the Parliament, Hegeler and Carus not only listened to speeches and solicited articles for their magazines, they also attended the gala of evening events as the members of Chicago society took turns entertaining guests with dinners and celebratory toasts. While documentation is at present lacking as to where Hegeler and Carus stayed, or if they sponsored any dinners or receptions, one can imagine they did because of Carus's work on the planning and advisory committees and the role both magazines played in the dissemination of the Parliament's impact. We know, for example, that they invited several of the Parliament's most popular delegates to visit the Hegeler residence in La Salle prior to beginning their lecture tours or returning to their homelands.

The first of the delegates to visit was Protap Chunder Mozoomdar, a well-known face among Unitarians and members of the Congregational churches on both the East and West Coasts. In 1883, he made a three-month visit to New England, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and the District of Columbus after which he authored *The Oriental Christ* that recalled his youthful endeavors to find answers to his spiritual quest. A great admirer of Emerson, he lectured at Alcott's Concord School of Philosophy praising Emerson's unique understanding of Hinduism. Although no longer drawn to the fold of Christianity as he had been in his youth, Protap remained an admirer of Christ despite what he considered was the West's distorted understanding of his true teachings

which, in many ways, resonated with his Hindu religion. “When we speak of an Eastern Christ, we speak of the incarnation of unbounded love and grace.” However, when speaking of the Western Christ, one thinks of theology, formalism, ethical and physical force. Like many of his fellow Hindus, Protap deplored the evangelical theology taught by Christian missionaries because they failed to convey the deeper meanings in Christ’s teachings. Although Christianity had originated in Asia, Evangelical Christianity had sent a “Western Christ”—a false prophet to destroy Hindu culture. Although Jesus was an “exemplar of a model man,” his missionaries had done nothing to convince Hindus of that fact. Instead, they made his teachings something to be feared. [35]

Another of La Salle’s guests, Swami Vivekananda, arrived resplendent in his robes and memories of the adulation he had received at the Parliament. Like Protap, he was an admirer of Emerson and knew just what ‘buttons’ to push when speaking to an American audience. Beginning and ending his talks with a quote from Emerson assured him of audience acceptance. Born in a prosperous Bengali family, he learned Western philosophy and science, focusing much of his studies on the writings of Kant, Hegel, Comte, Spencer, and Darwin. Quoting from any of these made him beloved in western audiences. His short clear and concise speeches before the Parliament made clear his understanding of the West as well as the richness of the Hindu faith. Although critical of Western society, his comments usually fell on appreciative ears even when he said: “You train and educate and clothe and payment to do what?—to come over to my country and curse and abuse all my forefathers, my religion, and my everything. . . . If you want to live, go back to Christ. You are not Christians. No, as a nation, you are not.”[36]

La Salle’s third visitor was Anagarika Dharmapala of Ceylon whose beliefs, influenced by Theosophists Henry Olcott and Madame Blavatsky, promoted a vision of Buddhism that emphasized personal responsibility, meditation, and compatibility with western science. He entered the brotherhood of the Anagarika, an order of the homeless, and rose in its ranks to become one of the leaders of the Buddhist reform movement in Ceylon. His ability to quote from Western popularizers of the sciences, and his facility in connecting their ideas to Buddhism,

resonated with views already held by Carus and Hegeler. Following his visit, he embarked on a three-month tour of the United States as a missionary of Buddhism and Sri Lankan nationalism.

Over the years, Carus remained in contact with Dharmapala, advising him on the intricacies of America's regional belief systems (i.e., the differences between West Coast Theosophists and those who attended the conferences at Green Acre in Maine), and in politics. Not only did Hegeler help defray the cost of his travel to the United States and his lecture expenses, but even supported the cost of a manager, William Pipe, to arrange his tours.[37]

Without question, the strongest and most lasting relationship existed between Carus and Shaku Soyen, the Zen master from Japan. Part of the reason was the speech the abbot prepared for the Parliament on causality which related closely to Carus's own monograph, *Monism and Meliorism.* At the close of the Parliament, Soyen and Toki Horin visited La Salle for several days before returning to Japan. On their arrival, they presented their hosts with several poems, and in the conversations that followed, Carus and Soyen agreed to cooperate in an endeavor to advance the Religion of Science. From Soyen's perspective, articles and books published by the Open Court could convey the true meaning of Buddhism to the American people and demonstrate its modernity in terms of Western science. "The late Parliament I think is the forerunner of the future universal religion of science," he explained to Carus. Similarly, Carus viewed Soyen as his entrée into the East, identifying and providing access to original works that he could publish in English.[38]

* * *

The Parliament of Religions left a lasting impression on the Open Court's publisher and editor. Both joined in the chorus of those who felt that it had amplified the spiritual bonds between and among the world's great religions. Amid the eclectic range of beliefs and practices evident in its presentations, symposia, workshops and ceremonies, they felt reassured of evidence of an emerging Science of Religion and a Religion

of Science. There was but one truly catholic or universal religion and it was based on truth which required free investigation, the rejection of authority, and accepting only the strictest methods of science. When shown to be genuine, it proved to be divine. It was a revelation in the true and original sense of the word. Interest in Eastern spirituality, including the linking of science (i.e., evolution) with faith in Christ and Buddha, foreshadowed the beginnings of this new universal harmony, and along with it, growing opposition to missionary colonialism, and the seeds of a new era of interreligious dialogue in which *The Open Court* and *The Monist* would play an important part in the coming decades.

Chapter 7

Changing Climate

As noted in Chapter 4, Hegeler and Carus decided to change the masthead of *The Open Court* for the third time in 1893. Looking back, one can see that the change had been premature owing to the fact that, for the next decade, the magazine and the book publishing arm of Open Court was focused on the uncharted religions and philosophies of the East. Who would have guessed that in the decade following the Parliament, a host of manuscripts and correspondence would arrive at the Open Court's offices in Chicago and La Salle seeking to address Eastern religions and philosophies? One such example was "The Fundamental Teachings of Buddhism" by the Rev. Mr. Zitsuzen Ashitsu of Japan, who left his manuscript with Carus before returning home. Within a year's time, topics ranging from Buddhism in Japan, to Buddhist opinions of Christianity, the negative impact of Christian missionaries abroad, the Buddhist conception of the soul and immortality, and the law of Karma, made their way into the pages of *The Open Court* and *The Monist.* Some had been speeches delivered at the Parliament and modified afterward. These included "The World's Parliament of Religion" by Charles C. Bonney; "The Debate on Christian Missions" by Virchand R. Gandhi; and "Christian Missions," a debate that took place before the Nineteenth Century Club of New York.[1]

New Viewpoints

The Parliament changed the mindsets of both Hegeler and his editor. No longer did they publish negative opinions of Hinduism and Buddhism. In an editorial in the October 18, 1894, issue of

The Open Court, Carus wrote glowingly of the Buddhist concepts of the soul and Karma. Similarly, in *The Monist* magazine he explored the similarities between Buddhism and Christianity, explaining that many erroneously believed Buddhism to be pessimistic and nihilistic, a religion of "utter desolation." In the development of his ideas on Buddhism, Carus admitted to holding the same pessimistic attitudes as most western thinkers. But now he no longer held those views. Instead, the Buddhist concept of Nirvana stood in sharp contrast to such misinterpretations. Although he had initially been unsure of himself, he wrote of having Hegeler help him to understand.

> Being a man of practical life, he [Hegeler] would not be satisfied with stones when he needed bread. Formerly, I was often inclined to believe that such views as I propounded in my booklet, Monism and Meliorism, were for the few and select only, that they were impractical and not adapted to the needs of men who stand in actual life. My acquaintance with Mr. Hegeler has cured me for good of these doubts. The truths which we preach are simple enough, and yet they are hard to understand. But they are hard to understand only to those who have not as yet freed themselves from the illusion of self. We do not mean to say that we are Buddhistic, or that we endorse either the Northern or Southern Buddhism in all its tenets and excrescences, which are many. We simply state our agreement on this fundamental doctrine of the anatman or non-self of a metaphysical ego-entity as the basis of a correct conception of the immortality of the soul.[2]

As a reflection of their eagerness to broaden the Open Court's world-view, during the early 1890's Carus and Hegeler joined a number of learned societies and associations, including membership in the British and American Associations for the Advancement of Science, the American Philosophical Association, the American Oriental Society, the Royal Asiatic Society of London, the Maha-Bodhi Society of Calcutta, the Society of Biblical Research, and the Egyptian Exploration Fund. Among their social clubs were the Author's Club of New York; the Chicago Press Club; the University Club of Chicago; and the Alter Deutsch Studente. Among the folders in the Open Court

Papers are membership cards and certificates in over eighty different clubs, societies, and associations.[3] On numerous occasions, both men participated in their meetings.[4]

The Gospel of Buddha

On November 8, 1894, Carus announced the publication of *The Gospel of Buddha.* As recalled by D. T. Suzuki, the idea for writing the book originated during the visit of Soyen to La Salle after the close of the Parliament.[5] Between his visit and the book's publication, Carus sent advanced sheets of the work to Soyen who liked what he read: "I think you may well be said to be a second Columbus who is endeavoring to discover the new world of Truth."[6] Carus assembled his text using a wide range of translations from Pali, Sanskrit, Chinese, and other languages. He also relied heavily on European sources, particularly Max Muller's *Sacred Books of the East* (1879-1910), Samuel Beal's *Travels of Fah-hian and Sung-Yun* (1869), *A Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese* (1871), *The Romantic Legend of Sakya Buddha* (1875), *Buddhist Canon* (1878), *Life of Buddha by Asvaghosha Bodhisattva* (1879), and Rhys Davids's *Buddhism* (1877), *Buddhist Suttas from the Pali* (1881), and *Vinaya Texts* (1881-85. "While I studied the Buddhistic scriptures," Carus explained in a letter to Soyen, "I was very much struck with their truth, their beauty, and ethical grandeur, and I hope that the book when published will create a sensation in Europe and America. It will open the eyes of many."[7]

Choosing from a variety of texts across centuries and cultures, Carus presented a largely Mahayana version that, while not historically accurate, resonated with those most compatible with post-Enlightenment science. Much like the New Testament, the texts were arranged and at times even rewritten to ensure the compatibility of Buddhism with science and modernity. In a certain sense, one could say that Carus prepared *The Gospel of Buddha* with the idea of it becoming the cosmic religion of the future. This is because he viewed modern Buddhism to be much more in touch with science than Christianity could ever achieve given its odd patchwork of dissenting denominations and sects. Though admittedly not a true representation of the Buddhist canon,

The Gospel of Buddha was warmly received. Its first edition sold more than three million copies and was translated into more than a dozen languages. Not only did it appeal to Western audiences but also Western educated Asians who read it eagerly as a truly indigenous philosophy and not just a Western version of Buddhism. The Buddhist authorities in Ceylon recommended it as required reading in their schools. According to Thomas Tweed, except for Olcott's *Catechism,* its publication contributed to both the Indian Renaissance and the Sinhalese Buddhist Revival.[8]

Reviews came quickly, and whether positive or negative, Carus published all of them. The Swedenborgian Charles Bonney congratulated him on the publication, but he found Buddha no match for the "coming unity of mankind in Jesus Christ." The same response came from John Barrows, former chairman of the planning committee for the Parliament of Religions, who predicted that Christianity, not Buddhism, would win out in the survival of the fittest.[9] Others, like John Maddock of Minneapolis, were more personal in nature and challenged Carus to confess whether or not he was a Christian. Carus responded that he reserved the right to call himself a Christian, Buddhist, Freethinker, Kantian, Aristotelian, or anything else provided the names were not used "in a sense that is exclusive." Having adopted the Religion of Science, it was of no great importance what names were applied.[10] Later, he would clarify his views in a much more straightforward manner.

> The truth is I have started from Christianity, I have shed the slough of that which is untenable or transient, I have incorporated into and assimilated to my views all that appealed to me as true and good in other quarters. I have grown in comprehension by becoming acquainted with the doctrine of the Buddha, the teachings of the ancient Greek philosophers, the meditations of the old Chinese thinker Lao-Tzu and kindred spirits. At first it was a shock to me, so long as I still thought that unless Christ and his truth are unique Christianity is worthless, and I passed through transitional phases in which the old orthodox narrowness was an impediment to my growth. But the spirit of Christ is not limited to the personality of Jesus. I have come to the conclusion that Christianity exists not

> only in Christianity, but its essence appears also in other religions, Buddhism, Taoism, the old Zarathushtrian Mazdaism, Hindu philosophy, and I am convinced that it appears also on other planets wherever rational beings originate, and aspiring creatures actualize in their history the highest ideals of life.[11]

Among those Buddhists who saw themselves as members of an emerging new world order, *The Gospel of Buddha,* much like *The Buddhist Catechism* (1881) of Henry Steel Olcott, represented the dawning of a once traditional religion but which now included western science along with its exposition of religion and philosophy. Buddhism was fast becoming the religion of the most westernized classes in the East, and soon hoped to replace the non-progressive religions of the West. From Ceylon to Meiji, Japan, Buddhists were re-sculpting their future.

As for the scholarly world, its members were generally unimpressed with the book, attacking Carus's method of text selection, his mixing of Hinayana and Mahayana sources without good cause, as well as crossing different ages, different collections, and different cultures without explanation. Although intended as an "honest effort," it ended up being a misleading attempt to make Buddhism scientific based on unprovable assumptions.[12] J. Estlin Carpenter considered the book neither philological nor historical, calling it worthless 'stuff,' As Carpenter stated: "He [Carus] places side by side extracts from books separated by hundreds of years in date and by still wider intervals of philosophic thought, as though they all alike represented the teachings of the founder of Buddhism. . . . Who that knows anything of the real significance of Gotama's teaching can tolerate such stuff as this. . . . The compiler has been struck with the ethical nobleness of many Buddhist sayings. His spirit is excellent, but his method is execrable."

Stung by the criticism from so-called academic specialists, Carus invented the word *scholaromaniac* to explain the peculiar disease acquired by those who lacked an acquaintance with practical life and tended instead to fill themselves with personal vanity. As a member in the Royal Asiatic Society, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences,

and the Society for Biblical Research, among many others, Carus was no amateur scholar. For those who though otherwise, Carus responded angrily:

> The collection which I have made is not restricted to "the teachings of the founder of Buddhism," and I have made no attempt at critically sifting that which is well authenticated from that which is legendary. That may be madness, in the eyes of a scholaromaniac, but there is method in it; and Professor Carpenter should have found it out himself. I am not quite so ignorant as Professor Carpenter thinks, and possess sufficient scholarly training to distinguish between historically reliable and unreliable accounts. But I embodied with good purpose much that a historian would have to reject. And yet I can claim that the picture of Buddha, as it appears in *The Gospel of Buddha*, is not unhistorical. It is historical in a higher sense of the word, for it represents Buddha, such as a tradition of two thousand years has moulded him, as he lives to-day in the minds of some of his noblest followers.[13]

Déjà vu

When *The Open Court* celebrated its eleventh anniversary in January 1897, Carus not only announced that the magazine would change from a weekly to a monthly, but that the wording of its masthead would also chang, this time from "Devoted to the Science of Religion," to "Devoted to the Science of Religion, The Religion of Science, and the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea."[14] Prior to making this decision, several proposals had been made to change the focus of the magazine. In 1896, The American Congress of Liberal Religious Societies, which formed in May 1894 as a direct outgrowth of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions, urged the merger of its publication, *The New Unity* with *The Open Court* to make it the official organ of both the Congress and the Religious Parliament Extension. Carus opposed the idea but gave the decision to Hegeler who decided on a compromise that gave recognition to the legacy left by the 1893 Parliament without replacing its core purposes.[15]

This change, the fourth in the magazine's eleven-year history, was followed Charles Bonney who, in the lead article, explained the importance of the magazine's new mission by setting forth several principles to clarify the meaning of the masthead.

- By the Religious Parliament Idea we mean the application of the Golden Rule to the things of religion; and that differences of opinion and belief should be made the grounds for friendly conference and comparison for mutual benefit; while all controversy and persecution on account of such differences should be resolutely suppressed.
- We hold that differences of knowledge, opinion, belief and resulting lines of conduct should not be made causes of strife, but should excite sympathy and effort to be sincerely helpful.
- We hold the obvious truth that everyone must be helped, if at all, in the state in which he is, and that nothing intended to be helpful to him can be received unless it be adapted to his present actual condition.
- We hold that a large allowance should always be made for the imperfections of language and the difficulties of expressing with precision the ideas which there is a desire to communicate.
- The supreme object of The Open Court is to spread the light of Science and Religious Truth throughout the world, and to bring those who hold different convictions into harmonious relations in which they may be helpful to each other.
- We hold that while Truth, as we have said above, is Eternal, Immutable and Divine, its manifestations have ever varied and must continue to vary, not only from age to age, but from day to day.
- We do not regard differences of opinion and belief in Science or in Religion as unimportant. . . . No matter how widely we may differ from those convictions, we are bound by the highest considerations to regard them with kindness and respect.
- The interchange of religious views should be characterized by perfect frankness and sincerity, coupled with an earnest effort to avoid giving offense. In this way only can progress be made. . . . This is the doctrine of the World's Parliament of Religions. Fraternal conference on differences of opinion and belief is the crucible in which the dross of error is best separated from the pure metal of Truth.[16]

As a member of the Church of the New Jerusalem, Bonney held a Swedenborgian view of Christianity and therefore extended "the love and sympathy of the Golden Rule to Brahmin and Buddhist, Parsee and Confucian, Jew and Liberal, and to all forms of the Christian faith." This, he held, had been explicit in the writings of Swedenborg and reason for the success of the Parliament. It meant that no matter how widely people differed in their convictions, all were obligated to show kindness and respect, love and service, and freedom from all attempts at coercion or persecution. The Religious Parliament Idea implied the application of the Golden Rule to all matters of religion and that differences of opinion, no matter how extreme, should be met with "friendly conference and comparison for mutual benefit." To these ends, *The Open Court* was dedicated to spreading the light of Science and bringing those with different convictions into "harmonious relations in which they may be helpful to each other."[17]

Over the next several years, Carus proceeded to write numerous articles and books on Asia addressing their different philosophies and their relationship to science; the differences and similarities between Christianity and Buddhism; issues inherent in missionary work; and the post-Parliament influence of Eastern philosophy and religion on the Western world. His books included:

- *Karma: A Story of Buddhist Ethics* (1894)
- *The Gospel of Buddha* (1895; 1915; 2004)
- *The Dharma, or, The Religion of Enlightenment: An Exposition of Buddhism* (1896)
- *Buddhism and Its Christian Critics* (1897)
- *Lao-Tze's Tao The-King* (1898)
- *The Canon of Reason and Virtue* (1898)
- *Nirvana: A Story of Buddhist Psychology* (1902)
- *Portfolio of Buddhist Art, Historical and Modern* (1906)
- *Amitabha; A Story of Buddhist Theology* (1906)
- *T'ai-shang Kan-Ying P'ien* (1906)
- *Yin Chih Wen* (1907)
- *Chinese Life and Customs* (1907)
- *Chinese Thought; an Exposition of the Main Characteristic Features of the Chinese World-Conception* (1907)

In the January 23, 1896 issue of *The Open Court,* Carus wrote a lengthy article titled "Buddhism in Its Contrast with Christianity, as viewed by Monier Williams." The Boden Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford, Williams's books on Brahmanism, Hinduism, and Buddhism were well known and respected in the West. Carus's single concern with his writings was not that he wrote from the standpoint of a Christian but that he felt Buddhism was unworthy of being called the "Light of Asia." Such distortions of Buddha's life and doctrines were odious misrepresentations that Carus found offensive. Williams even went so far as to argue that Buddhism was not a religion in the proper sense of the word since it denied the existence of an eternal soul; acknowledged no supernatural revelation; had no priesthood or real prayers; nor any real worship. Carus's response was direct and to the point. "For myself, I must confess that I never felt more like a true Buddhist than after a perusal of Professor Williams's description of Buddhism; for I am now more firmly convinced than ever, that our Church Christianity can only become a scientifically true and logically sound religion of cosmic and universal significance, by being transformed into that Buddhism which Professor Williams refuses to regard as a religion in the proper sense of the word."[18]

Carus accused Christianity of failing to free itself from its pagan roots. Whatever advantages it had over the followers of Buddha in the Western world, it remained fixated on the past. "Buddhists would not say of Mohammed, or Zoroaster, or Confucius that they are false prophets. Buddhists recognize the prophetic nature of all religious leaders," and referred to Ashoka's twelfth edict that "There ought to be reverence for one's own faith and no reviling of that of others."[19]

Insofar as Carus could determine, Buddha was "the first positivist, the first humanitarian, the first radical free thinker, the first iconoclast, and the first prophet of the Religion of Science." The more he acquainted himself with Buddha's writings the more certain he was of Buddha's "far-seeing comprehension of both religious and psychological problems." Without the scientific materials available in his world at the time, he pronounced boldly a religion that stood in contradiction to the solutions held by dogmatic Christians and did not react with

mere negatives. “In a word, he pronounced a religion based upon facts which should replace a religion based upon the assumptions of belief.” While he assured readers he was not attempting “to sink the Religion of Science into Buddhism,” he nonetheless insisted that Buddhism “in its noblest conceptions is in strong agreement with the principles of the Religion of Science” in that it “it anticipated some of those important truths which we are in need of emphasizing to-day in the face of the dogmatic assertions of traditional religion.”[20]

So what should Christians think of Buddhism? Should people be alarmed? “We think not!” answered Carus. “We believe that the awakening of a greater interest in any one religion can only help to bring out the truth, whatever the truth may be. A renewal of the life of Buddhism will stimulate the religious life of Christianity.” As both Hegeler and Carus were firm believers in the world of free trade, this also applied to the domain of thought. “Buddhism seemed to be dead in Japan until Christian missionaries came, and it owes to them its regeneration. There are Buddhist priests of Japan who recognize their indebtedness to Christianity, and most of them feel very friendly toward the representatives of the foreign faith.” The same applied to Christianity, Carus assured his readers. “If there is anything good in Buddhism let the Christians learn from the Buddhists.[21]

* * *

The question for Hegeler and Carus was not whether Christianity was a distant cousin of Buddhism but whether it had the ability to accept the scientific achievements of the Enlightenment. The same applied to the ability of the Christian churches to understand that dogma had no place in a world dedicated to intellectual freedom and the unity that existed between true faith and science. Otherwise, Buddhism stood a good chance of outgrowing Christianity in its significance and power. Not only did it lend authority and legitimacy to the Religion of Science but lent support as well to the belief in monism. Buddhism exhorted people to dismiss the self and live by their deeds to fellow man.[22]

Chapter 8

The Company

As noted in Chapter 1, when the Open Court's four shareholders met at the Palmer House in Chicago on February 5, 1887, they elected officers to the company's Board of Directors: Edward C. Hegeler as president, Camilla Hegeler as vice president, Eugene E. Prussing as secretary, and Benjamin F. Underwood as treasurer. The other intended purposes for the meeting involved approving the name of the magazine *The Open* Court; appointing Underwood as the magazine's editor and business manager for one year upon such terms as agreed between Underwood and Hegeler; and authorizing the secretary to use of the Company's seal. Even though Underwood resigned his editorship effective the end of December 1887, his title as treasurer of the company and his ownership of one share continued until February 10, 1903, when the Board of Directors met at the Hegeler residence in La Salle to transfer Prussing's share and title to Mary Carus, and Underwood transferred his share and title, to Paul Carus. There were several additional meetings of the Board that took place at the residence: On January 10, 1905, a draft 'by-laws' was read; on January 24, 1905, the 'by-laws' were approved; and on February 2, 1907, the Board authorized Mary Carus to draw checks against the company's account.[1]

Staffing

The production side of the company required a chief clerk (Martin A. Sacksteder) in the Chicago office, along with a typesetter, printer, and a secretary to handle subscriptions and mailings. The financial, editorial, and managerial arm of the Open Court was located on the

ground floor of the Hegeler residence with offices for Carus, Hegeler, Mary Carus, and Thomas J. McCormack who translated and served as Carus's editorial assistant. Each took a hand at contributing to "notes," "comments," and book reviews. Carus identified himself with the letters "P.C." or "Paul Carus" on those he authored, while McCormack used "Thos. McCormack," and Edward Hegeler, Mary Carus, and later, Lydia G. Robinson, used the Greek letters: κρς, Θκ, and μκρκ. Exactly who was who remains unclear. As for D. T. Suzuki, he preferred "T. Suzuki" to identify his authorship.

Thomas J. McCormack (1865-1932) was born in Brooklyn, New York, earned a classical education at Princeton University where he graduated in 1884, after which he continued his studies in Germany at the universities of Leipzig and Tübingen where he studied history, political science, and languages. On his return to the States, he studied jurisprudence at Columbia and then Chicago Law School where he earned the L.L.B. Although admitted to the bar, he chose not to practice. Instead, he joined the Open Court in 1888 and began translating the writings of some of the most formidable thinkers from German and French into English for publication as books or as articles for the magazines. Among the mathematicians, physicists, biologists, physiologists, psychologists, and theologians whose works he translated were those of Hermann Grassmann, Henri Poincaré, Felix Klein, Hermann Schubert, Ewald Hering, Wilhelm Wudt, Théodule-Armand Ribot, Alfred Binet, Paul Topinard, Ernst Haeckel, and August Weismann. He also translated and edited works by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz, David Hume, Bishop Berkeley, and René Descartes for publication by the Open Court.

Beside his translations and editorial work, McCormack contributed notes and articles for both magazines as well as handled a good portion of the mail. In 1903, after fifteen years working in the La Salle office, he resigned to become principal of the La Salle-Peru Township High School. With first-hand knowledge of the works of John Dewey, Francis W. Parker, and other leaders in progressive education, and his close association with Hegeler and Carus, he was well equipped to address the issues of secondary education.[2] Replacing McCormack was Lydia G.

Robinson who joined the company in 1905 as assistant editor, translating books from German and French, and writing book reviews. A graduate of Rockford College, she stayed with the company until 1917.

Teitaro Suzuki (1870-1966) worked at the Hegeler residence from 1897 to 1909, handling multiple tasks including translating, editing, authoring, and even household chores. Born in Kanazawa City, two years after Japan's Meiji Restoration of 1868, he lost his father when still and child, and due to the economic, political, and social changes brought about by the Restoration, the family was left in poverty. After completing grade school, he attended public school in Kanazawa, followed by the University of Tokyo in 1891. Because of the family's financial situation, he was forced to withdraw from the university without a degree. Nevertheless, he learned sufficient English to teach it in the local schools. While a university student, he became a disciple of Imakita Kōsen, Abbot of the Engakuji Temple in Kamakura, one of the strongholds of Zen Buddhism in Japan. Following his death, Suzuki became a disciple and translator for the new Abbot, Shaku Soyen. When Carus needed a collaborator for the translation of the *Tao Te Ching* and other texts in Chinese and Japanese, Soyen recommended the twenty-seven-year-old Suzuki for the position.

Suzuki remained at La Salle for eleven years, a decision which he admitted to making "on the spur of the moment," and which brought enormous challenges to his life, some overtly discriminatory, and others that catapulted him into becoming the foremost expert on Zen Buddhism. Suzuki recalled that "living in the remote countryside [of La Salle] was like being buried alive," a situation in which he felt "powerless to do anything."[3] Presumably, the only person of Japanese descent living in La Salle, Suzuki's life must have been difficult. When he invited a young Japanese friend to La Salle without permission on the assumption that the editor would find him employment, Carus refused. "I do not know what to do with him," complained Carus. "How can I look around to procure some kind of subsistence for a stranger of whose abilities I know nothing."[4] In addition, Suzuki's relationship with M. A. Sacksteder, chief clerk at the Open Court office in Chicago, remained

strained because each preferred a different method of organizing files, addressing typesetting issues such as arranging accent marks, and other matters involved in the day-to-day preparation of copy.[5]

Besides occasional trips to Chicago and a visit to Boston where he examined the papers of Emerson and Thoreau, Suzuki's only real break during his time in La Salle occurred in 1905-1906 when he accompanied Shaku Soyen as his translator on the abbot's year-long lecture tour across the United States. When he finally left La Salle in 1909, he lived abroad for a while, during which time he depended on financial support from Hegeler who died in June 1910, just a few months after Suzuki returned to Japan. As much as can be discerned, it was principally Hegeler and Mary Carus who supported Suzuki's financial needs during his travels through Europe and who continued to reimburse him for copies of requested materials found in different libraries and private collections. In each instance, however, Suzuki made the habit of seeking permission from Carus before taking any journey, and sending Hegeler bills for his research and expenses. Carus kept him on the payroll during his stay at the Swedenborg Society in London where he translated the Swede's *Heaven and Hell* (1910), *The New Jerusalem and Its Heavenly Doctrine* (1914), *Divine Love and Wisdom* (1914), and *Divine Providence* (1915) into Japanese, and wrote a short biography titled *Swedenborugu* (1915). His financial connections with the Carus family ended in 1915.[6]

In addition, there was Martin A. Sacksteder, chief clerk (1888-1899) and later sales manager (1900-1909) for the company at their Chicago office. Boxes of correspondence exist between Sacksteder, Carus, Hegeler, McCormack, and Lydia Robinson dealing with typesetting, page proofs, and expenses incurred by the company. Evident in the correspondence was also a chorus of complaints concerning Sacksteder's managerial judgments which began with frustration over lost manuscripts, the lack of timely follow through, and office costs exceeding budget. In one undated letter to Sacksteder, Carus reprimanded him for drawing on monies deposited in the bank to cover only the business needs of the Chicago office but which Sacksteder appeared to have used for unspecified personal purposes.[7]

It seems that Sacksteder had a habit of contracting personal debts and borrowed several times from Hegeler to avoid financial ruin. In fact, both Mary Carus and her father loaned him money amounting to approximately $4,500. With Hegeler's permission, Carus raised the clerk's salary hoping that he would avoid incurring future debt.[8] He even hired Catherine Cook to relieve him of some of his chores. But when Cook raised questions regarding the status of certain withdrawals from the office's cash box, Sacksteder sought to have her dismissed. After several efforts to correct Sacksteder's behavior, Hegeler directed the company's attorney to dismiss him. Following Hegeler's death in 1910, Sacksteder became a player in the inheritance feud initiated by Herman and Julius Hegeler (See chapter 8).[9]

Carus met Philip Edward Bertrand Jourdain (1879-1919) at the International Congress of Mathematicians at Cambridge in 1912 and offered him the position of English editor for *The Monist* at the company's London office. Besides editing Augustus De Morgan's *Essays on the Life and Work of Newton,* Ernst Mach's *History and Root of the Principle of the Conservation of Energy,* Georg Cantor's *Contributions to the Founding of the Theory of Transfinite Numbers,* and George Boole's *Laws of Thought,* he initiated a new series for the Open Court Publishing Company titled "Classics of Science and Philosophy." Jourdain's own contributions concerned the historical and philosophical foundations of science. These were published in *Mind, Scientia, Isis,* Charles Joseph Singer's *Studies in the History and Method of Science,* James Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* and the *Hibbert Magazine.* He also edited the *International Magazine of Ethics.* In *The Monist* alone, he published thirty-one articles. He remained with the company until his death in 1919 from a progressive paralytic condition known as Friedreich's Ataxia.

Other employees in this early period included Percy F. Morley, who worked for the company between 1917 and 1918 before being sentenced to Fort Leavenworth as a "political objector," and Carl H. Haessler (1888-1972), a 1914 Rhodes Scholar who earned his Ph.D. in philosophy at the University of Illinois in 1917 and served time in

Fort Leavenworth as well. Morley's introduction to the perils war came with his translation of an article by Ernst Schultze on the contributions of German Freemasons to the war effort, causing a backlash from the lodges in Italy, France, and England.[10]As for Carl Haessler, whose father was also a conscientious objector, he was informed that the charges against him would be removed provided he wore the uniform and performed military service. If he refused, he would be placed in a stockade, court-martialed, and sentenced up to 25 years. Viewing the war from a socialist point of view, and convinced it had been motivated by commercial and imperialistic considerations, he refused the offer. Married and a father of a young child, he accepted court-martial and was sentenced to twelve years at Fort Leavenworth. He was released in August 1920 by presidential pardon after which he obtained employment with the *Milwaukee Ledger,* the *Federated Press,* and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. In 1963, he was offering counseling advice for conscientious objectors to the Vietnam War.[11]

Among the staff working for the Open Court at the La Salle office between 1898 and 1906 were Julius Krumeich, Charles S. Wolf, Frederick Sigrist, and Emma Mason. In 1901, their weekly paychecks ranged between $3 to $35, with Suzuki at the bottom and Thomas McCormack at the top.

Thomas McCormack	$35
Julius Krumeich	$18
Charles S. Wolf	$15
Frederick Sigrist	$15
Emma Mason	$15
Teitaro Suzuki	$3

Suzuki began working for the Open Court for $2 weekly in 1897, an amount that was increased to $3 in 1901. John Ramsey, manager of the Hegeler properties, provided Suzuki with room and board at his home for which he received a $6 stipend to his weekly paycheck. By any standard, however, Suzuki faced a less than the optimum situation in terms of a living wage, which explains why receipts exist among the payroll materials indicating payments by Hegeler to cover the cost of a suit and other necessities due to Suzuki's chronically impoverished condition.[12]

Stats

During the period of Underwood's editorship, approximately half of the articles in *The Open Court* centered around criticism of orthodox religion, advocacy of the Free Religious Association and other liberal religious movements, protecting the rights of women, and addressing ethics and social injustices. By contrast, Carus's choice of articles involved monism, ethics, psychology, and politics, the latter area being of particular concern to Hegeler. As for Carus's editorials, they usually addressed monism, philosophical problems, or psychology. Generally speaking, the topics in both magazines were more erudite than what Underwood had chosen for publication.

When *The Monist* began publication in 1890, Hegeler intended it to be lengthier and to address more abstract philosophical and scientific topics. At the same time, *The Open Court* was reduced in size from sixteen to eight pages per issue until it changed to a monthly in 1897 when the pagination increased fourfold to make up for the fewer issues. The peak years for *The Open Court* were between 1897 and 1908 when circulation ranged between 2500 and 3,650. Subscriptions to *The Monist* were substantially less, reaching as high as 1,500 in 1912, but averaging between 600-800.[13] Except for the success of *The Gospel of Buddha,* the financial situation at the Open Court remained precarious due to the rising costs of paper; expensive last minute corrections sent to the typesetter; the numbers

of magazines and books printed in excess of demand; storage costs for thousands of unsold volumes; and the decision of Assistant Postmaster General Edwin C. Madden to change the postage rate for mailing the magazines from second-class to first-class. On its magazines alone, the Open Court lost about $16,000 annually.[14]

Advertising

The Open Court gave little attention in its early years to advertising. Nevertheless, common with almost all magazines and journals at the time, Hegeler offered "clubbing rates" for those wishing to save money by bundling their subscriptions. Individuals interested in this option could bundle two or more magazines for a reduced yearly subscription price. Orders for more than two magazines resulted in additional discounts. This gave Open Court subscribers the option to pay reduced rates for over thirty popular magazines including *Arena, Atlantic Monthly, Century Magazine, Harper's Weekly, North American Review, and Scientific American.*

Not until 1892 did the company acquire European agents: Watts and Company of London which was listed through 1897, and Ackermann and Eyller in Leipzig which lasted only one year. In 1897, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company at Dryden House in Soho became Open Court's London agent through 1911. In Leipzig the agent was Otto Harrassowitz at 14 Ouerstrasse; in Tokyo, Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha at 11-16 Nihonbashi; in Singapore, Kim & Co. at 6-B Battery Road; and in New York, Baker & Taylor Co. at 33-37 F, Seventeenth Street. After 1911, Philip E. B. Jourdain handled the London business of the Open Court, and Platt and Beck replaced Baker and Taylor in New York.[15]

By 1909, the Open Court was advertising in *The Living Age, The Buddhist Review*, *Bibliotheca Sacra, American Anthropologist, Psychology and Scientific Methods, The Hibbert Magazine, The Philosophical Review,* and *The Malabar Quarterly Review.* Nevertheless, advertising was haphazard at best and complicated by catalogs that were published irregularly, and little to no information available on the company's inventory. In 1915, Catherine Cook, who began as a

secretary before moving to the position of manager of the Chicago office, took on the role of the company's first sales agent, using newspaper advertising and mailing lists to connect the company's inventory to the larger bookstores. She also began attending the annual conventions of the American Booksellers' Association which resulted in a significant increase in sales.[16]

Expansion

The company's Chicago address changed over the years. Its first location was in the Nixon Building at 169—175 La Salle Street, and remained there until 1893 when the company's growth forced its move to the Monon Building at 320—326 Dearborn. From there it moved to 1322 Wabash Avenue (1905-1907); 378 Wabash Avenue (1908-1911), and 623 S. Wabash Avenue (1912-1913). In 1914, the offices moved to the tenth floor of the People's Gas Building at 122 S. Michigan Avenue.

In 1888, the Open Court began selling reprints of its articles for 10 cents, and serialized articles in book form for twenty-five to thirty-five cents each. The first book published by the Open Court was Max Müller's *Three Introductory Lectures on the Science of Thought,* followed by Carus's *The Idea of God* and Edward D. Cope's *The Marriage Problem.*[17] In February 1889, the Open Court announced Alfred Binet's *Psychic Life of Micro-Organisms,* and a month later, readers were apprised of Carus's forthcoming *Fundamental Problems: The Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge,* followed several months later with his *Principles of Art, Monism and Meliorism,* and George M. Gould's *Dreams, Sleep, and Consciousness*.

By 1894, the company was selling monthly issues of *The Open Court*; quarterly issues of *The Monist; The Gospel of Buddha; Karma: A Story of Early Buddhism* and *The Redemption of the Brahman.* By 1897, the company's list of publications numbered forty-eight, of which fifteen were authored by Carus, including his newest, *Buddhism and Its Christian Critics*. Nearly eighty percent of the publications were original material rather than topics reprinted from the two magazines. In addition, the company now advertised several new

series, including the "Religion of Science Library," "Religions, Ancient and Modern," and "Philosophical Classics." The company also began selling portraits of the great philosophers and mathematicians which were available on regular paper for $7.50 or on heavy Japanese paper at $11.00. It even sold Japanese floral calendars.

The Hegeler Institute

While Carus basked in the abundance of correspondence arriving daily at his Open Court office at La Salle, Hegeler was looking for ways to secure the company's financial well-being and reputation. In January 1899, he met with Charles. C. Bonney at his law office on Madison Street in Chicago to discuss his idea for organizing an institute of learning which he simply called the Hegeler Institute of Learning. The idea had been on his mind since the early 1880s when he first discussed it with Underwood and Carus. Based on their conversation at the law office, Bonney wrote Hegeler a month later and shared with him a draft of what the Institute might look like. Regardless of its source of funding, Bonney loved the idea and proposed a set of principles that not only reflected Hegeler's long-standing interest in the concept but also the principles explicit in *The Open Court's* revised masthead.

- To teach the Science of Religion and the Religion of Science;
- To promote the extension and enlarge the influence of the work and principles of the World's Religious Congresses at Chicago and to encourage the holding of similar convocations;
- To establish for these and kindred purposes a school, institute or college to be called "Church of Science;"
- To promote perfect religious liberty, and perfect charity toward individual differences of opinion in Religion, Science and politics;
- To inculcate the sacredness and supremacy of Truth, and the duty to ascertain and obey it, holding that the earnest pursuit of Truth is a rational bond of union among the lovers of Truth however various may be their personal views;
- To give such aid as may be found expedient to enlarge the success and secure the perpetuity of the Magazine known as "The Monist"

and "The Open Court", and other publications of The Open Court Publishing Company; and to make or cause to be made such other publications as may be deemed advisable;

- To give instruction in Philosophy and the application of its principles to the improvement of social, industrious and political life;
- To cause Lectures to be given both at home and abroad as shall be found convenient in furtherance of these objects;
- To acquire suitable locations and erect proper buildings for the attainment of the objects herewith expressed and incidental purposes;
- To acquire, hold and use suitable property, whether real, personal or mixed, with full power to sell, convey and dispose of the same as may be deemed expedient;
- And generally to do or cause to be done all such matters and things as may from time to time be deemed advisable for the accomplishment of the objects and purposes set forth.[18]

In a letter to Hegeler a month later, Bonney mentioned that Carus had called on him to talk about the proposed Institute and expressed his willingness to give it his utmost attention if implemented. Bonney advised Hegeler that, should he wish to move forward with the Institute idea, his son-in-law should avail himself of every opportunity to "strengthen his position in the learned world as much as possible."[19]

In 1900, the Institute became a reality with the establishment of "The Hegeler Trust Fund" that Hegeler supported with an initial investment of $600,000 and turned it over to his daughter Mary Carus to manage. The monies in the trust were to be used to support the Open Court's two magazines and its publications, as well as for other purposes deemed worthwhile in furthering the work of the World's Religious Congresses. Due, however, to Hegeler's death and the subsequent feud over his estate, those aspects of the Institute that referred to the acquisition of property for the establishment of a college or "Church of Science" never materialized. Otherwise, *The Open Court* and *The Monist* fulfilled much of what Bonney identified in his draft. Both

magazines flourished even after Carus's death in 1919, and ended only with the passing of Mary Carus in 1936.

* * *

Within months of its existence, the Open Court began publishing original works of the leading scholars in Europe, America, and Asia. No other publishing company, and certainly no family-owned publishing house, came close to emulating the breadth and depth of its influence. Part of what explains its uniqueness is the realization that Hegeler considered it more important to facilitate the communication of scholars and their ideas than to turn a profit. In fact, it remains a question whether profit ever really mattered. As Thomas J. McCormack, assistant editor, once explained. "Our magazine is conducted at a considerable financial loss, and if it were not for the contributions of our president, we should be unable to pay anybody anything."[20] From the start, Hegeler willingly bore the cost of the company's debts and generously endowed it, and then increased the amount, a practice continued by Mary Carus until her death in 1936. Such was the determination of Edward C. Hegeler and his descendants to secure the company's future and its influence in the world of ideas.[21]

Chapter 9

Requiem for a Leader

Edward C. Hegeler remained active until his death on Saturday, June 4, 1910, when he succumbed after a two-week illness that began with an attack of bronchitis and deteriorated into pneumonia. He died at age 74 with all members of the family around him except for a daughter who resided in Germany. His body laid in state in the Hegeler residence where virtually the entire workforce at M&H ZINC, plus relatives and friends, paid their respects. The casket was covered in two large floral arrangements, one contributed by the employees of M&H ZINC, and the other by his former friend and partner Frederick Matthiessen. The hundreds of other floral arrangements sent to the Hegeler family were placed on display at the local public school. The funeral service began in the afternoon on Tuesday, June 7th, and out of respect, the businesses in La Salle closed for an hour from 3 to 4 p.m.[1]

The service, which was held at the family residence, opened with a solo vocal by Mrs. George Trimble of Ottawa, followed by a prayer by the Rev. E. J. Ridings, pastor of the La Salle Congregational Church, and another selection by Mrs. Trimble. The Rev. Ridings, then gave the sermon in which he described Hegeler as "imposing in his appearance, venerable in his full snow white hair and beard, and commanding respect with the serious expression of his broad browed face." Known for his opinionated stance on matters, including a degree of stubbornness, he "was like one of the ancient patriarchs, wont to lead and to be obeyed."[2]

Following the sermon, Mrs. Trimble sang another solo after which Carus offered some final words, describing his father-in-law as

forever curious and who counted among his friends some of the greatest thinkers of the age. Stripped of dogma and ideology, he had shown his openness to the search for truth and a basis for ethics. Though his idea of God had changed, he had chosen not to dispense with the term; nor had he forgotten religion's purpose which he discovered in Monism. Along with a growing interest in the psychology of immortality, he came to believe that one's ancestors survived as memories in the mind of each individual, just as their own memories carried forward to future generations. This was the meaning of immortality. Finally, Carus spoke in more personal terms, remarking that the greatest gift he ever received from his father-in-law was the opportunity to have a vocation that so truly suited his purposes. "He gave me . . . a field of activity so unique that I could nowhere else in the whole world have found anything so suited to the vocation which I had set for myself." Although Carus did not say it, by appointing him editor and manager of the Open Court's two magazines, he was able to give substance to the publisher's dreams in ways that his own children could not.[3]

Following Carus's remarks the pallbearers, who Hegeler had personally selected from the workforce at M&H ZINC, carried the casket down the veranda's massive staircase to a funeral car. With hundreds of the company's employees walking behind, the cortege made its way to the Oakland Cemetery where a final ceremony took place. There, the employees formed a circle around the grave site, within which the pallbearers gathered along with the family and close friends. At the foot of the grave stood Julius Hegeler, the oldest son, George Weerig, general manager of the zinc works, Charles Diesterweg, Hegeler's private secretary, and John Ramsey, steward over the Hegeler household. Final remarks were made in German by the Rev. Paul Brauns, pastor of the German Evangelical Church of Peru, followed by an old German mining song sung by the employees. The service ended with a quartette singing a special version of "Nearer My God to Thee," written by Paul Carus.[4]

The Will

When M&H ZINC went public in 1871, the stock, which amounted to 426 shares, was divided between Hegeler and Matthiessen, each

receiving 212 shares. They also agreed that after the company went public, Hegeler would become the company's president and Matthiessen its secretary. Their agreement lasted over thirty years before it began to unravel, caused by a restlessness among their descendants who looked covetously at what the two partners had left.

On August 11, 1903, Hegeler made his last will and testament. Because his wife, Camilla, had died before him, those assets he had bequeathed to his wife and children and announced in her will, were now once again reiterated in his own will and testament. In both instances, the information caused most of the siblings to resent the fact that the assets went to the oldest daughter Mary Hegeler Carus who was to continue serving as president of M&H ZINC and its many assets as well as executrix of the will. In this regard, he bequeathed to her all the property ("Homestead") in the town of La Salle, together with its stables, horses, carriages, and blocks of land. In addition to her responsibilities as president of M&H ZINC and director of the ten-mile-long La Salle & Bureau County Railroad Company, he had made her owner of the Open Court Publishing Company with a sizable trust in the amount of $600,000 to support its operational needs and aspirations. Mary was to receive fees for her role as trustee and executrix of his will while continuing to hold and control the shares of M&H Zinc until the expiration of the company's charter at which time she was directed to convert the shares into money for distribution among Hegeler's children or their survivors.[5]

Included in the will were six codicils, the most significant of which were the third (dated July 22, 1905), fourth and fifth (dated March 27, 1906). The codicils were written to define Mary Hegeler Carus's role in the Hegeler Institute of Learning; stipulated the amount and distribution of monies to various nieces and nephews; and most importantly, provided clarification regarding the inheritance of monies going to three of the Hegeler children: Julius and Herman Hegeler, and Camilla Hegeler Bucherer. Regarding the two sons, Julius and Herman, the codicils took note of the fact that each had already received the amount of $450,000 after Edward Hegeler learned that they had secretly tried to sell the company in 1902 while he was vacationing in Europe.

Disappointed in their deceitful actions, Hegeler had given them a portion of their inheritance and sent them out on their own where they started a competing zinc manufacturing company in Danville, Illinois. The codicils stipulated that the monies Hegeler had provided them would be subtracted from any additional monies coming from the estate. With respect to Camilla and her husband, Alfred H. Bucherer, the codicils stipulated that the portion of the estate intended for Mrs. Bucherer would be held in trust for the children until they came of age. In the meantime, Mrs. Bucherer was to receive a portion of the interest produced by the trust and Prof. Bucherer was to receive a onetime payment of $30,000. Finally, the will stipulated that if any of the descendants contested the validity of the will or any of its codicils, they "shall receive nothing [and be] wholly cut off from receiving any portion of my estate."[6]

The Challengers

For years, Mary's siblings had taken exception to what they perceived was their father's favoritism toward her; and now, believing she was benefitting to an even greater degree as executrix for the estate, they felt the need to challenge the will. Mary's two brothers, Julius and Herman, along with their sister, Camilla, felt they had nothing to lose and the most to gain by challenging the will and its codicils. To do this, they had to remove or restrict their sister's authority from executing the intent of the will.[7]

While both sides prepared for the legal battles ahead, little was known to the public except for the occasional rumor that never seemed to take flight. Even the final agreement submitted to the court and signed by Mary Carus and her siblings remained a secret. In fact, there is almost no evidence of the events that transpired except for several documents found in the Open Court Papers belonging to Paul Carus who watched from the sidelines as his wife's siblings set out to revise the will. What he observed was a multi-pronged effort waged against the reputation of Edward Hegeler, his daughter Mary, and himself, by

those who perceived them as unduly benefitting from the contents of the will.

Among the documents found in the Open Court Papers is an unpublished and incomplete seven-page manuscript written by Carus that recounts a series of dreams he experienced during the period when his wife's siblings were seeking to break the will. "Fear not, but fight," Hegeler's spirit urged him in his sleep. "I will help you. When criminals do wrong in the name of virtue, it is time for the dead to return. Here I am and I will come again." Despite pressure coming from his father-in-law, Carus had to face his wife who implored him to keep out of the feud. "I do not care for the money and my rights as executrix," she assured him, "so let that go; I see ruin for the whole family, for you and me, and all the rest of us, if we begin to quarrel publicly." As the story unfolded, Hegeler's spirit continued to communicate with Carus, but the dreams became weaker and ultimately failed to carry the influence they intended. "The sentences which I heard in these later dreams as coming from the lips of my father-in-law were not unlike communications received over a poor telephone connection, sometimes dim as if coming from a distance and then breaking off suddenly." When Carus explained to Hegeler that his wife did not wish to fight for fear of bringing ruin to the family, the spirit replied: "Marie is very considered. She always was considerate; but they pay her with ingratitude." With those comments, the manuscript ends without a conclusion.[8]

Also in the Family Papers are notebooks filled with poetry written by Carus that date from the years before and during his time in Dresden, his three years in England, and later in Boston, New York, and La Salle. Not surprisingly, his earliest poetry was written in German while his later poems were in English. Although they covered a multitude of subjects, much of it was written during his courtship of Mary Hegeler. However, as he observed the deviousness of his brother's and sister's in-law as they attacked the reputations of both their father, and his wife Mary, he vented his frustrations in poetry, one of which he penned in November 1911:

To My Brothers-in-Law

I do not fear an enemy

Who deals out honest blows;

But helpless against treachery,

I shrink from sneaking foes

You talk of honor and speak lies

You rob in virtue's name.

Such adversaries I despise

Who lack the sense of shame.

This time you got the best of me

By blackmail and deceit,

But know ye that your victory

Means but your own defeat

Enjoy the spoils which you have won

Enjoy them as ye list.

I won't forget what you have done

Forget that you exist

Your memory shall be to me

Like heavy dreams I dreamt

Like nasty nightmares! Ye shall be

Beneath e'ven my contempt.

T'is poison to me when I think

Of the foul deeds which you wrought

Into oblivion ye shall sink

Into the empty nought

Let sunshine fall into my life

I think of noble men

Of hopeful children—of my wife

That makes me whole again.[9]

"The Intrigues of an Inheritance Case"

Aside from the poetry, the most significant document found among the Open Court Papers is an undated and unsigned 108-page narrative (plus an addendum of nearly forty pages) which Carus titled "The Intrigues of an Inheritance Case." Except for the pseudonyms he used to conceal the names of the persons involved, the story recounts the history of the siblings' efforts to circumvent the intent of the will. It is unclear if the narrative remained in the hands of Carus and was never shared, or whether copies of it were eventually read by some or all of Carus's descendants. Nonetheless, it remains the only known account of the events that took place following the death of Edward C. Hegeler.

(pseudonyms)	**(actual names)**
Edward Helling	Edward C. Hegeler
Mary Helling Harris	Mary Hegeler Carus
George Harris	Paul Carus
Camilla Helling Bucherer	Camilla Hegeler Bucherer
Julius W. Helling	Julius Weisbach Hegeler
Herman Helling	Herman Hegeler
Annie Helling Eccle	Annie Hegeler Cole
Suleikha von Hoff-Schell	Lena Zuleikha von Vietinghoff
Olga Helling Himel	Olga Hegeler Bai Lihme
M. A. Stacker	M. A. Sacksteder, head clerk
E. C. Clark	Catherine Cook, secretary
G. Clarence	Clarence Griggs, attorney
Follett Bull	W. B. Follett, attorney
Judge Arba N. Seaman	Judge William H. Seaman
John Ramsey	same
Emil Storm	same
Dr. John K. Mitchell	same

Dr. Silas W. Mitchell	same
Dr. Patrick	same

Because of Hegeler's codicils regarding his daughter Camilla and her husband Alfred Bucherer in the disposition of his estate, Carus used the early chapters to provide context. Applying the above pseudonyms, he explained that Professor Alfred Bucherer had made a good initial impression on the Helling family when he was courting Camilla due largely to various accomplishments that were attributed to him. However, it soon became apparent that the claims he made were less than truthful. The first occurred when Camilla Helling shared with her family the proposal he made to her in a letter that he signed as Alfred von Bucherer. The word "von" indicated he was of German nobility, a term which Bucherer claimed he had dropped out of "sheer modesty," but it had no real basis in fact. In another instance, Bucherer informed the Helling family that he was an officer in the German Reserves, implying that he was on leave, and had not resigned. When Dr. Harris, who happened to have been a German officer himself, became aware that Bucherer's leave of absence had not been signed by the king, but by a non-officer, he forced Bucherer to admit he was not an officer. Lastly, Bucherer claimed to have been the discoverer of the Roentgen X-Ray before Roentgen, insisting that his patent was on record in Washington although the record of it was "no longer kept on file."[10]

Not long after the marriage, Edward Helling became aware that Bucherer had difficulty supporting his family, and wishing to help, created a position for him at the M&H Lead Co. in 1892. However, his employment did not last because Bucherer "behaved as if he were the prospective owner of the works and almost from the beginning of his appointment [was] implicated in serious quarrels with all the heads of the several departments." Eventually, he wrote a letter to Helling insisting that the men whom he claimed had offended him should be fired. When nothing resulted from his demand, he resigned his position on February 26, 1893, accusing his father-in-law of being "unjust and

insulting." Mr. Helling met the complaint and the insult with patience, and despite Bucherer's accusatory tone, informed him that he was always welcome at the Helling residence in La Salle. Rather than remain in the country, the Bucherer family returned to Bonn where they continued to be financially dependent on Mr. Helling who was pleased to assist. As explained by Dr. Harris, "Mr. Helling once said that peace could be better maintained at a distance and he was glad that Professor Bucherer lived in Bonn."[11]

It was eventually learned that Bucherer had behaved poorly since his student days at Tübingen, and later at Strasbourg. He had differences with the faculty as well as with fellow students. One incident with a student had led to a duel with pistols which fortunately ended without injuries to either party. Bucherer eventually earned his Ph.D. in physics at Strasbourg and became a private docent first in Leipzig and later in Bonn where he used the title of professor. However, it was a titular title that did not equate to the rank of faculty. As Dr. Harris explained, "the appointment of a real professorship has not been granted to him, nor is it now a probability that he will ever be either an extraordinary professor nor an ordinarius."[12]

Over the years, Bucherer applied for teaching positions at American universities but nothing materialized, and he blamed Dr. Harris for poisoning his chances. In 1908, for example, Dr. Harris met Professor Harry Crow who informed him that Bucherer had applied for a faculty position at the University of Illinois and would soon be asked for a reference from President Edmund J. James. Dr. Harris explained to Crow that Bucherer was a difficult man to be on good terms with, and that he had trouble with fellow students and with faculty. Furthermore, he remarked that "Mr. Helling will not take kindly to the idea to have Mr. Bucherer so near." Shortly afterwards, Bucherer wrote Helling accusing Dr. Harris of acting dishonorably by preventing him from receiving a university position. Bucherer claimed that Harris had written a prejudicial letter to President Edmund J. James at the University of Illinois. Harris admitted to talking to Professor Harry Crow but denied ever sending a letter to President James.[13]

Shortly after Mrs. Camilla Helling's death in 1908, Dr. Harris visited the Bucherer family in Bonn and found them very bitter because of her Last Will and Testament (which made the same dispositions about the inheritance as written into Edward Helling's will). At the time, Dr. Harris sympathized with his sister-in-law and offered to draft a letter from her to her father explaining "the pain and humiliation she felt on reading her mother's will." She signed and sent the letter to her father who remained unimpressed due to Professor Bucherer's inability to "adopt the spirit of the letter and act accordingly." Helling had "made up his mind" on the matter, and despite efforts by Harris to intercede on behalf of the Bucherer family, Helling held firm. "I am willing to bear the whole blame, they may scold me and condemn me. I do what I deem best. If I give my money to Camilla, I might as well give it to Bucherer directly, and I do not want him to waste what I have earned."[14]

With the above information as context, Carus's account of the effort to challenge the Hegeler will began with several of the siblings seeking to prove their father's insanity. To accomplish this, Camilla Helling Bucherer, her husband Alfred, and the Helling brothers and their lawyer, sought testimony to prove the unsoundness of Edward Helling's state of mind. This involved procuring statements from two physicians, Silas Weir Mitchell and his son John K. Mitchell, both of Philadelphia, who attended Helling in 1897 for a nervous breakdown following a head injury he sustained in the mill; and the other, by a Dr. Patrick who treated Helling in his last illness.

In the matter of Helling's head injury, Dr. John K. Mitchell wrote a letter dated December 13, 1910, explaining that, following the head injury, Edward Helling had "a great many fantastic hypochondriac notions, amounting to systematized delusions" caused by an "inflammation of the brain." Treatment involved cold compresses applied to the patient's head. Mitchell recalled that Helling even slept on cold water pillows and wore a ventilated hat. On the basis of these observations, Mitchell speculated that Helling was "liable to be influenced for or against persons about him by trifling circumstances of an unimportant kind, and to attribute to personal feelings or intentions of slighting him, acts of

an entirely natural origin. Even while his judgment in the larger affairs of life and business remained perfectly sound, his judgment where his feelings or affections were concerned, was not good." As for Helling's more recent illness, Dr. Patrick remarked: "I have seen the patient only three times during his last illness, and I know nothing more concerning prior conditions than what others told me; so my statement is absolutely worthless so far as the will is concerned."[15]

Because the statements of both physicians were couched in carefully worded reservations based on opinion rather than facts and because Helling had been known to have an exceptionally clear head in his business associations and as publisher the Open Court and its two magazines, the siblings could find no legitimate reason to pursue the insanity issue. Although not forgotten, the charge was put aside.

The next effort undertaken by the brothers involved attempts to damage the reputations of the executrix and her husband. To accomplish this, the brothers' attorney, Follett Bull, hired detectives who, with the help of John Ramsey, foreman for the Helling property, hired employees to spy on the family. Ramsey, who was of the opinion that the two brothers had been unappreciated by Edward Helling, employed the gardener Emil Storm to report on Helling's state of mind in the days prior to his death, and on any women Dr. George Harris happened to meet, inferring that he was a womanizer. At the office of the Forum Publishing Company (Open Court) in Chicago, former chief clerk Mr. M. A. Sacker (Sacksteder) weighed in as well, agreeing to build a case suggesting a liaison between Harris and Miss E. C. Clark (Catherine E. Cook) who had replaced Sacker after his dismissal. This involved several thousand dollars' worth of detective work to discover where Miss Clark lived, and harassing her with callers for bogus reasons.[16]

Although Mary Harris was fully aware of the animosity of her two brothers and of her sister Camilla and her husband, she was disappointed to learn that her other three sisters (Olga, Annie, and Suleikha) had turned against her as well. As the siblings grew bolder in their efforts to change the will and its codicils, the brothers prepared two draft "Agreements," the first intended to procure for Mrs. Bucherer control

over her children's portion of the inheritance. Not until guardianship for the Bucherer children's trust was negated by a judge did Mary Harris agree to the change.

The second "Agreement" was designed to force Mary Helling Harris to forfeit her unilateral authority under the will by agreeing to be guided by a Board of Governors consisting of her siblings. This required the executrix to renounce several of the fees given to her in the will for managing the estate, and forfeit one share of M&H ZINC which Mary had purchased with her own money before she was married. The "Agreement" also demanded that she renounce her trusteeship of the Helling Trust Fund which supported the Forum and its two periodicals, *The Forum* and *The Mind* for which her husband was the managing editor. Mrs. Harris agreed to renounce her fees and her single share of M&H ZINC but refused to relinquish her trusteeship of the Helling Trust Fund for she feared that her brothers would fire her husband and sell the Forum and its publications to interested buyers. Only when Olga Himel took sides with Mary did the others agree to remove all reference to the Helling Trust Fund and the Forum Publishing Company. Nevertheless, they forced Dr. Harris to surrender his share of the Homestead Bureau County Railroad which his father-in-law had given him as a gift. Mr. Clarence, the company's attorney, urged Mary to sign the agreement in order to avoid potential lawsuits and the bad publicity that would, he predicted, damage the family's reputation.

Alarmed at the recklessness of her brothers and their lawyer, the executrix consulted Judge Arba N. Seaman, a former judge on the Appellate Court of Illinois. After examining the will and its codicils, the demands from the siblings, and the draft 'Agreements,' Seaman urged the executrix to take a stand against her brothers. On learning that the executrix had sought the judge's advice, Mr. Clarence met with him and suggested that "all the trouble could easily be adjusted if the husband of the executrix would leave the country." Clarence's recommendation was based on a potential scandal arising from Dr. Harris's alleged dalliances. In his response to Clarence's warnings, the judge replied: "Even if the accusations were true, . . . they [the siblings] should not have used them to intimate their sister in the execution of

her duties as executrix, or extracted from her money values amounting to half a million dollars." Despite the judge's recommendation, Mr. Clarence urged the executrix to avoid the family's disgrace if the information were made public.[17]

To force a settlement, Julius Helling sent Mary a file of incriminating evidence regarding her husband's alleged affairs. Simultaneously, the local papers announced Sacker's suit against Dr. Harris and his wife, causing the executrix to experience symptoms of a nervous breakdown. When Sacker's lawyer threatened to go public with what he alleged was evidence of her husband's affairs, Clarence assured Mrs. Harris that the recriminations against her husband, "whether true or not, would be sure to create a scandal." Quoting from Clarence, "Sometimes it is best to pay blackmail." Despite her husband's desire to fight the accusations, Mary settled the suit out of court by paying Sacker $3,000 and releasing him of the mortgage obligations for his home. What bothered both Mary and Dr. George Harris was the disturbing prospect that Mr. Clarence, the estate's lawyer, seemed to have joined the siblings in accommodating their demands.[18]

Rather than face the scandal that her siblings threatened, Mary Harris signed the second agreement in October 1910. In it, she forfeited the fees and stock gifted to her by her father; and agreed to be advised by a Board of Governors in carrying out her role as executrix of the will. In return, her siblings consented to end further challenges to their father's sanity, cease any further threats regarding Dr. Harris's alleged affairs, and also end their efforts to take control of the Forum Publishing Company. All this was agreed to by Mary Harris who "could not stand to have her father's memory dishonored by having witnesses, among them rude and vulgar men, and who had been his own servants in his life, be called into court and give their opinion about their former employer."[19]

Additional evidence of what transpired can be found in the remarks by Arba N. Seaman whom Mary had retained to advise her regarding the execution of the will. In a letter to Carus, the judge repeated the opinion he had previously given that Mary's siblings "have not shrunk from using the vilest means to prevent their sister from doing her duty and to

coerce her to surrender her privileges and emoluments in defiance of all justice and equity."

> In remembrance of her noble father, who was one of my highly respected and valuable friends, I gladly accepted the call of Mrs. C. to act as her counsel. I served her to the best of my ability and regret that my advice was unacceptable to her though it was the only course which she could take with safety. Her rights under the will were absolutely unassailable and if she had remained firm, the tricks attempted by her aggressors would have lead only to their own undoings. Mrs. C. should not have yielded to the demands of the other heirs, but I have no word of reproach for her because her motives were pure generosity and sisterly good will. Never in my juridical practice either as judge or lawyer have I become acquainted with any one as unselfish and regardless of her own interests as she has proved herself to be, and I believe there will scarcely be one person among a thousand who would have acted like her under similar circumstances. . . . I approve of your course in having written out the case in all its details. Indeed, I had planned myself to publish an article on the subject and have only been prevented by lack of leisure.. . . Thus it is but proper to have the documents collected and preserved for future reference.[20]

It is somewhat ironic that, having succeeded in changing the will, the siblings proceeded to fight among themselves over the spoils. The first indication of this was a suit brought by Mrs. Camilla Bucherer against all the heirs of the estate demanding that they share in the payment of their attorney who was demanding a fee of $50,000. When her siblings realized that the $50,000 would be deducted from their share of the inheritance, they refused, causing Camilla and her husband to break with the other siblings. Next, the brothers sought to charge Dr. Harris with threatening them with bodily harm until they were advised they could be liable to pay damages if their case proved to be a failure. They then abandoned their scheme. They then claimed that Dr. Harris, whose salary was $1,200 per year, and later raised to $3,000, received extra compensation through illegal means. When their investigation showed no evidence of their accusations, the matter was dropped.

Finally, the brothers sought to negate the payout of their inheritance in depreciated stock which led to further disruption when the sisters saw no need to change the Agreement. Furthermore, when the siblings learned that their attorney, who had been highly recommended by the brothers, demanded payment of $50,000, an amount that would be taken from their estates, the brothers ceased to be on good relations with the sisters. Finally, there was the bill in the amount of $150,000 from Mr. Clarence as compensation for his expenses. Since his payment was originally supported by the brothers and by Prof. Bucherer, each of whom had benefited from this advice, the brothers found even more reason to carry their feud into the future.[21]

* * *

Carus's "The Intrigues of an Inheritance Case" is the only known record of the events that led to the signing of the two "Agreements." Whether it represents an accurate portrayal of what actually took place remains unclear since there is no evidence of a rejoinder from those siblings who challenged the will. Nevertheless, Judge Seaman's response to Carus's inquiry offered a reasonable explanation in that it showed the callous degree to which Mary and Paul Carus were treated by other family members, as well as by some of their own employees who had agreed to spy on them. It also provides a fair assessment of Mary Carus's fear of what scandal would do to her father's legacy and to her own family's reputation. If Carus had been unfaithful to her, and it seems likely that he had been, Mary Carus chose to prevent it from becoming public knowledge. In her mind, the forfeiture of money and property was far less important than the public disgrace of the family. Paul Carus did not actually deny the accusations and there seems to be evidence of a relationship with Catherine Cook who managed the Chicago office and later edited *The Point of View, An Anthology of Religion and Philosophy Selected from the Works of Paul Carus* (1927).[22] Given society's rules regarding sex and gender roles, it seems that Carus, like many Victorian males, believed that his dalliances---whatever they may or may not have been—were private matters that gentlemen kept to themselves.

Postscript

Although speculation about what could have been is not particularly useful in writing history, the fact that *The Open Court's* first editor and business manager, Benjamin Underwood, later became editor of the *Religio-Philosophical Magazine,* a weekly newspaper devoted to spiritual philosophy, and in particular, the phenomenon known as the Borderland, or the life of spirits after death and their communicative abilities with the living, is worthy of examining. That he and his wife Sara turned to Spiritualism suggests that the editor's resignation in December 1887 spared Hegeler what could have been a fight of significant proportions regarding the content and direction of *The Open Court*.[1]

Modern Spiritualism is founded on a belief that communication with the spirits of deceased humans can be scientifically confirmed and verified. Proof of this belief was based on *rappings*, a term describing the first tapping out of messages between living persons and spirits which reputedly took place at the home of the Fox family in Hydesville, New York, on March 31, 1848. As news of this manifestation spread across the country, it filled a vacuum that both society's elite and the aspiring lower and middle classes celebrated at various levels of understanding. Utilizing philosophical, theological, and scientific explanations, all buoyed by corroboration from committees of respected citizens, the rappings became proof of religious promises made over the centuries of an afterlife. It postulated that life continued in the form of an indestructible spirit that, after physical death, lived on and continued to reflect the temperament of the individual, his or her feelings, and even their physical characteristics. Death was simply a moment in time when the spirit separated from the material body. From that point

onward, the spirit alone existed as the organized entity; it represented a transformation, a change in status, and nothing more.[2]

As the rappings spread across villages, towns, and cities in the United States, the Fox sisters and their imitators borrowed from Mesmer's novel *baquet* to create a *spirit-circle* or *séance* used for carrying messages from beyond the grave. The séance became the portal for all classes to communicate with family and friends on the "Other Side." These were not magisterial demonstrations of great minds imparting wisdom, but simple queries to answer questions concerning personal family matters. What formerly had been in the hands of a few inspired revelators now became the property of all willing participants—a democracy of hearts and minds. While some séances produced strange noises, levitation, and apparitions, others were more high-brow in that they produced poems, essays, and commentaries allegedly written by dead poets, politicians, novelists, and divines affirming the continuance of their careers in the spirit-world. By describing these apparitions of the dead as 'spirits,' the term *Spiritualism* captured a more serious concept of the dead than the historical use of the term *ghost*. As materializations sprung into existence, they brought the world of spirits into everyday conversation.[3]

The news of what was occurring in these séances caused an explosive growth in converts to Spiritualism enough to threaten mainstream denominations in the second half of the nineteenth century. The inability of traditional Christianity to explain what was happening, sent ministers searching through their creeds to find reasons to accept or reject the phenomena. It was one thing for pastors to recount stories of mythical saints and miracles in their sermons, and another to condone a local incident as a part of that supernatural and otherworldly tradition. Torn between the desire to believe and notable instances of fraud, numerous efforts were undertaken to test the claims by subjecting them to the rigors of scientific investigation.

By the 1890s, Chicago had become a center for occult activity. It was home to a number of spiritualist and theosophical organizations, the western hub of the New Thought movement, and home to the Western Society for Psychical Research, the more extreme branch of

the American and London Societies for Psychical Research. Together with an assortment of telepathic, clairvoyant, and astral travelers, the Society catered to spirit communicators and other varieties of psychical healers promising to heal, improve individual powers, or simply serve as a docking station for interstellar communicators.

During the Columbian Exhibition of 1893, Benjamin Underwood served as secretary to the Congress Auxiliary on Psychical Science, a division of the Congress on Science and Philosophy which met August 21-25 with plans to bring its research findings before the bar of public opinion. In keeping with this intent, the Smithsonian ornithologist Elliott Coues, Vice-Chair of the Psychical Science Planning Committee, promised to treat the whole range of psycho-physical manifestations on which Spiritualism was based by looking at them historically, analytically, and grouping the presentations around the categories of telepathy, mesmerism, hallucinations, premonitions, apparitions, and clairvoyance. Coues promised to prevent "cranks and other objectionable persons" from participating in the congress, thereby demonstrating that it deserved the dignity of being called a "true science."[4]

Among the participants at the Psychical Congress were Underwood's wife, Sara; psychical researcher Richard Hodgson; philologist and official representative of the London Society for Psychical Research Frederick W. H. Myers; temperance reformer and suffragist Frances Willard; Secretary of the Treasury Lyman J. Gage; eclectic physician and Neoplatonist scholar Alexander Wilder; journalist Lilian Whiting; and the scientist and physician Edmund Montgomery. Charles Bonney originally assigned a smaller hall for their meetings but had to move their venue to the Halls of Columbus and Washington to accommodate the thousands of believers and curiosity seekers interested in hearing its papers and discussions.[5]

Before a packed hall, Sara Underwood explained how she had been brought up in the doctrines of the Methodist Church but had lost her faith in Christianity in her twenties when she was taught "hard materialism." Because of the emotional feelings that resulted from her loss of faith, and disappointment that Agnosticism offered little satisfaction, she set

out to discover the truth concerning her being and existence. Although she had Spiritualist friends, she admitted throwing aside their literature with contempt, thinking it a "deliberate fraud," and made no attempt to attend séances or interview mediums.[6] She claimed that her first psychic experiments were made with a planchette in 1872, but when her husband regarded them as "frivolous in character," she lost interest until the fall of 1889 when she reported receiving communications from "disembodied, invisible, intelligent beings who once dwelt in the flesh." After sharing the information with her husband, he became a willing participant in her experiments. In fact, she learned that her hand often refused to write unless her husband put forth the questions. Before long, both were participating in the communications, with Sara using her hands to converse, and Benjamin asking the questions. She concluded that their "blended power" caused harmonious conditions that enhanced communication with spirits.[7]

Sara Underwood's *Spirit Writing, with Other Psychic Experiences* (1896), included an introduction from her husband who explained that beneath the "repellant mass of imposture and delusion" that accompanied the phenomena of Spiritualism, there remained a level of facts that science could neither explain nor deny. This, he believed, was the case with his wife's automatic writing which she performed "without volition, thought, or effort," and without any physical or mental effort on the part of the person who produced the writing. His wife was convinced, and he as well, that a 'spirit agency' guided her hand, an experience that did not occur until she was over fifty years old.[8]

Underwood described his wife as someone with "very pronounced opinions," who produced the writing without any conscious thought or volition on her part. At times, she wrote slowly, on other occasions, quickly and without pause. Sometimes her hand wrote words upside down, a form of writing she was never able to master by her own willpower. Otherwise, the only recognizable sensation that occurred during her automatic writing was a "gentle thrill" that came over her when she realized she was in the presence of the writing force which descended upon the top of her head and moved down through the neck, shoulder, arm, and then into the hand. She noted that many tens of

thousands possessed the gift of automatic writing.[9] Nevertheless, the messages came from spirits that once dwelt on earth, and addressed topics that she neither knew nor could possibly have known. Because of this, Underwood believed humankind was at the threshold of a discovery of laws that, like evolution, promised to open up new vistas of understanding. The truths of the existence of the supernatural were not above nature, but simply one "in the line of orderly evolution."[10]

Articles in *The Open Court* were divided on the subject of Spiritualism, with some calling it completely fraudulent while others urged serious consideration. Although Carus was more critical than positive, he wanted his readers to know he was neither an agnostic nor a negationist with respect to the topic. In 1894, he visited Lake Brady, the camp of a spiritualist association in Ohio, to examine for himself the practice of mediumship.[11] Trusting the world of facts, he noted that psychical research had "so far published nothing that might be considered a success in proving the survival of human personality after death in the sense set forth by the leaders of the movement. Admitting that he had followed with keen interest the experiments of the Society for Psychical Research, he took note of the fact that despite their "high-strung expectancy" of finding what they most ardently hoped for, the evidence thus far put forward for a survival of human personality after death was "very unsatisfactory to critical minds."[12] In 1902, in letter from Carus to Frederick Willpert, an inquiring subscriber, he remarked on behalf of himself and Hegeler: "We eschew all vagaries such as Theosophy and Spiritualism, strictly limiting our publication to subjects which are treated scientifically."[13]

Endnotes

Introduction

1 Thomas McCormack to M. A. Sacksteder, February 23, 1894, in Open Court Letterpress Book, No. 2, MSS 027, box 29, 23, p. 49.

2 Paul Carus, "In Memory of Mr. E. C. Hegeler," *The Open Court,* 24 (1910), 387-90; Arno Reidies, [Draft Memorial], Hegeler-Carus Family Papers*,* MSS 133, Box 4, folder 7.

Chapter 1: A Determined Man

1 Anna Katerina died of puerperal fever when Edward was only three years old.

2 See Matthiessen and Hegeler Zinc Company, *1858-1958, Our First Century of Service* (La Salle, IL: The Company, 1958); Arno Reidies, [Draft Obituary], Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Hegeler-Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 7.

3 See Julius Ludwig Weisbach, *Handbuch der Bergmaschinenmechanik* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1835); *Lehrbuch der Ingenieur-und Maschinen-Mechanik* (Braunchweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1851-60).

4 F. W. Matthiessen, "A Tribute to Mr. E. C. Hegeler," *The Open Court,* 24 (1910), 445.

5 Arno Reidies, [Draft Obituary], Hegeler-Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 7.

6 It took approximately three tons of ore and ten tons of coal to make a ton of the metal.

7 Matthiessen, "A Tribute to Mr. E. C. Hegeler," 445.

[8] F.W. Matthiessen quoted in Sherwood J. B. Sugden, "Historical Introduction," in *Open Court; A Centennial Bibliography, 1887-1987* (La Salle, Il.: Open Court Publishing Company, 1987), 13.

[9] Arno Reidies, [Draft Obituary], Hegeler-Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 7.

[10] Oliver Zunc, *Making America Corporate* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 200. Read Michael E. Lenzi, "Zinc Comes to La Salle and Peru, Illinois: The Historical Geography of the Matthiessen and Hegeler Zinc Company and the Midwestern Zinc Industry," in Michael P. Conzen, et. al., *The Industrial Revolution in the Upper Illinois Valley* (Chicago: Committee on Geographical Studies, The University of Chicago, 1993), 119-134.

[11] *History of La Salle County, Illinois* (2 vols.; Chicago: Inter-State Publishing Co., 1886), I, 752-54.

[12] "Recent American and Foreign Patents," *Scientific American,* 29 (1873), 249.

[13] Adam M. McKeown, "From Company to Corporation: The Business Expansion and Local Philanthropy of the Matthiessen and Hegeler Business Interests, 1871-1972," in Conzen, et. al., *The Industrial Revolution in the Upper Illinois Valley,* 135-149.

[14] "Gisela Hegeler," *The Open court,* 6 (1892), 3279.

[15] "Above the River," in John Drury, *Old Illinois Houses* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977 [1948]), 169. See also Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Restoration Work, MSS 133, Box 5.

[16] "Master Planning Notes," John Garrett Thorpe and Associates, September 5, 1994, in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Restoration Work, MSS 133, Box 5.

[17] Drury, "Above the River," 170.

[18] "Alwin Carus, "A List of Years," in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 133, Box 1, folder 36.

[19] Read Henry Sylvester Nash, *The History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1901).

[20] John S. Haller, *Fictions of Certitude: Science, Faith, and the Search for Meaning, 1840-1920* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2020), Introduction.

[21] "Mary Hegeler, Accidental Engineer," Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 7. Even her high

school notebooks were preserved. See Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 5.

[22] Kate B. Carus, "Marie Hegeler Carus—An Accidental Engineer," Conference paper, 1999 International Symposium on Technology and Society: Women and Technology—Historical, Societal, and Professional Perspectives, New Brunswick, N.J., July 1999).

[23] "Mary Hegeler Biography," Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 30, folder 13. Her descendants included Edward Hegeler Carus, president of the Carus Chemical Works; Gustave K. Carus of Chicago and connected with the Open Court Publishing Company; Mrs. E. Talcott Barnes of Eagle River, Wisconsin; Miss Elizabeth Carus of La Salle and Chicago; Herman D. Carus, secretary and superintendent of operations and M&H ZINC; and Alwin C. Carus of La Salle, and associated with his brother Edward in the operation of the Carus Chemical Works. There was also another child, Robert, who died in infancy.

[24] Paul Carus, "In Memory of Mr. E. C. Hegeler," *The Open Court,* 24 (1910), 388-89.

[25] "Correspondence and Statements," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 627-28.

Chapter 2: Bargaining for Position

[1] B. F. Underwood and John Marples, *The Underwood-Marples Debate, Commencing July 20, 1875 and Continuing Four Evenings, Between B. F. Underwood and Rev. John Marples* (New York: D.M. Bennett, 1877); B. F. Underwood, *Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy* (New York: D. Appleton, 1891); B. F. Underwood, *Progress of Evolutionary Thought* (Buffalo, NY: Green, 1893); B. F. Underwood, *Woman: Her Past and Present, Her Rights and Wrongs. A Lecture Delivered in Denver, Colorado Under the Auspices of the Woman Suffrage Association* (New York: Truth Seeker Co., 1911); B. F. Underwood, *The Influence of Christianity on Civilization* (New York; The Truth Seeker Co., 1889); B. F. Underwood, *Paine, the Religious and Political Reformer. An Address* (New York: The Truth Seeker Co., 1885); B. F. Underwood, *Christianity and Materialism* (New York: D.M. Bennett, 1878); B. F. Underwood, *Essays and Lectures* (New

York: D.M. Bennett, 1870s); B. F. Underwood, *What Liberalism Offers in the Place of Christianity* (New York: D.M. Bennett, 1870s); B. F. Underwood, *Naturalism vs. Supernaturalism* (Seymour, Indiana: Times Steam Job Print, 1880s); B. F. Underwood, *Modern Scientific Materialism: Its Meaning and Tendency* (New York: D.M. Bennett, 1880); B. F. Underwood, *Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity* (New York: D.M. Bennett, 1877); B. F. Underwood, *Jesus Not a Perfect Character* (New York: D.M. Bennett, 1875).

[2] Sara A. Underwood, *Spirit Writing, with Other Psychic Experiences* (Chicago: Thomas G. Newman, 1896), 21.

[3] "Correspondence and Statements," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 622. See also [Correspondence], The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 43, folder 2; and "Statements," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Accession II, Manuscripts, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 2.

[4] "Correspondence and Statements," 622.

[5] "Correspondence and Statements," 623.

[6] "Correspondence and Statements," 624. See also Open Court Publishing Co., MSS 027, Box 43, folder 3.2

[7] "Correspondence and Statements," 624-25.

[8] "Correspondence and Statements," 626.

[9] "Correspondence and Statements," 626-27

[10] "Correspondence and Statements," 627-28.

[11] "Correspondence and Statements, 628-29.

[12] "Correspondence and Statements, 628-29.

[13] "Correspondence and Statements,"630.

[14] "Correspondence and Statements," 631.

[15] "Correspondence and Statements," 632.

[16] "Correspondence and Statements," 633-34.

[17] "Correspondence and Statements," 634-35.

[18] Minutes, Board of Directors, February 5, 1884, in *Notebook of Minutes of Meetings of the Directors and Stockholders of the Open Court Publishing Company, 1884-1907*, in The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, [Unclassified material].

[19] [Minutes of the Board of Directors], 3-15.

[20] [Statement of Principles], *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 15.
[21] [Statement], *The Open Court,* I (1887), 15.
[22] "Salutary," *The Open Court,* I (1887), 15-16.
[23] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Basis of Ethics," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 18-22. The article would be republished in 1943 as *A Scientific Basis for Ethics* (Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Co., 1943). This was the only book published under his name.
[24] M. C. O'Byrne, "Eschatology and Ethics," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 190-93.
[25] Hegeler, "The Basics of Ethics," 22-24. See also "Reply to Hegeler's Ethics Article," Open Door Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 4.
[26] Hegeler, "The Basics of Ethics," 22-24.
[27] "Further Comments on Mr. Hegeler's Essay," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 82.
[28] Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Jails and Jubilees," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 176-78.
[29] Edward C. Hegeler, "A Criticism of Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton's Article' Jails and Jubilees,'" *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 212.
[30] Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "The Worst Enemy of Woman is Woman," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 34-35.
[31] William J. Potter, "Society and the Individual," *The Open Court*, I (1887), 2-3.
[32] Thomas Davidson, "The Need for Free Thought Education," *The Open Court,* I (1887), 3-4.
[33] Minot J. Savage, "A Theological Paradox," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 36-37.
[34] [Benjamin F. Underwood], "Dr. Edmund Montgomery," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 103-107.
[35] [Paul Carus], "Dr. Edmund Montgomery," *The Monist,* 19 (1909), 633. Paul Carus described his philosophy as "tinged with a poetical mysticism."
[36] "Notice," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 45.
[37] "What the Press Says of the Open Court," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 83.
[38] "Correspondence and Statements," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 637.

Chapter 3: The Intruder

[1] Paul Carus, *Homilies of Science.* Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1897), vi-vii.

[2] William E. Leonard, "Paul Carus," *The Dial,* May 3, 1919, 452.

[3] Julius Goebel, "Paul Carus," *The Open Court,* 33 (1919), 513-21; Paul Carus, *The Idea of God* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1896), 4. See Paul Carus, *Helgi und Sigrum, ein epische Gedicht der nordischen Sage* (Dresden: Grumbkow, 1880); and Paul Carus, *Metaphysik in Wissenschaft, Ethik un Religion eine philosophische Untersuhung* (Dresden: Grumbkow, 1881).

[4] See Paul Carus*, Algenor, eine episch-lyrische Dichtung* (Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882); Paul Carus, *Gedichte* (Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882); Paul Carus, *Lieder eines Buddhisten* (Dresden: Grumkow, 1882); Paul Carus, *Ursache, Grund und Zweck* (Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882); and Paul Carus, *Aus dem Exil* (Dresden: Grumbkow, 1884).

[5] Paul Carus, *Monism and Meliorism, A Philosophical Essay on Causality and Ethics* (New York: The Cherouny Printing and Publishing Co., 1885), 5; Paul Carus, *Primer of Philosophy* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1893), 1, 2, 4.

[6] Paul Carus, *Kant and Spencer. A Study of the Fallacies of Agnosticism* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1904), 2.

[7] Carus, *Monism and Meliorism*, 7, 10, 15, 30- 31; Carus, *Primer of Philosophy,* 1, 2, 4. By no means shy, Carus remarked: "If Kant compared his work to that of Copernicus, I may fairly liken mine to that of Kepler who filled out the Copernican system and reduced the law of motion of planets to simple mathematical formulae." See, Carus, *Monism and Meliorism,* 13.

[8] Carus, *Monism and Meliorism*, 54.

[9] Carus, *Monism and Meliorism,* 15-16, 62.

[10] Paul Carus, *Fundamental Problems* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1889), 21.

[11] Paul Carus, *God; An Enquiry into the Nature of Man's Highest Ideal and a Solution of the Problem from the Standpoint of Science* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1908), 42; William H. Hay, "Paul Carus: A Case-Study of Philosophy on the Frontier," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 17 (1956), 507-509; Guardiano,

Nicholas L., "Monism and Meliorism: the Philosophical Origins of the Open Court," *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy,"* 9 (2017), https://journals.openedition.org/ejap/1072 (accessed December 30, 2021).

[12] Carus, *Monism and Meliorism,* 71, 76.

[13] Carus, *Primer of Philosophy*, 5-6.

[14] Carus, *Monism and Meliorism,* 72, 73.

[15] "Correspondence and Statements," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 639-40. See also "Statements," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Accession II, Manuscripts, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 2; and [Correspondence], The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 43, folder 3.2.

[16] "Correspondence and Statements," 636. See also Open Court Publishing Co., [Correspondence], MSS 027, Box 43, folder 3.2

[17] The descendants of Paul and Mary Carus included Edward Hegeler Carus (1890-1975), president of the Carus Chemical Works; Gustave K. Carus (1893-1960) of Chicago and connected with the Open Court Publishing Company; Paula Talcott Barnes (1894-1954) of Eagle River, Wisconsin; Miss Elizabeth or "Libby" Carus of La Salle and Chicago; Herman D. Carus (1899-1993), secretary and superintendent of operations and M&H ZINC; and Alwin C. Carus (1901-2004) of La Salle, and associated with his brother Edward in the operation of the Carus Chemical Works. The couple's first child, Robert, died in infancy.

[18] "Correspondence and Statements," 636.

[19] Harold Henderson, *Catalyst for Controversy: Paul Carus of Open Court* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993), 323-34, 41.

[20] Paul Carus, "The Harmony of the Spheres," *The Open Court,* I (1887), 33-35.

[21] Paul Carus, "Th. Ribot on Memory," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 264-67.

[22] Paul Carus, "Goethe and Schiller's Xenions," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 318-20.

[23] Paul Carus, "Th. Ribot on Diseases of Memory, *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 344-48.

[24] Paul Carus, "Th. Ribot on Will," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 455-58; 487-90.

[25] [Carus to Underwood, undated,] in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Correspondence, MSS 133, Box 31, folder 24.
[26] Paul Carus, "Monism, Dualism and Agnosticism," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 209-212.
[27] "Monism and Monistic Thinkers," *The New Court,* 1(1887), 376.
[28] Sara A. Underwood, "I Do Not Know," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 273.
[29] "Correspondence and Statements," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 636-37.
[30] "The Soul," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 8.
[31] Gustav Freytag, "The Lost Manuscript," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 646-54.
[32] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Soul," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 396.
[33] Edward Marshall, "No Immortality of the Soul," *The New York Times,* October 2, 1910, p. 49.
[34] "Correspondence and Statements," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 636-37. See also Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 2.
[35] "Correspondence and Statements,"638.
[36] Benjamin Underwood, "The Editors' Farewell to the Readers of the Open Court," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 591-92.
[37] "Correspondence and Statements,"621-22.
[38] "The Title "Open Court" and Its Propriety," *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 824.

Chapter 4: Ringing the Changes

[1] Paul Carus, "Editorial Notes," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 641.
[2] "Definitions Explanatory of the Position of 'The Open Court,'" *The Open Court,* 3 (1889), ii.
[3] Edward C. Hegeler, "In Memoriam—Gustav Freytag," *The Open Court,* 9 (1895), 4487.
[4] [Incomplete statement, April 5, 1899] in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Records, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 4.
[5] H. C. Hegeler "Courses," The Open Court Publication Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 4.3. See also H. C. Hegeler, "Philosophy in American Colleges and Universities," *The Monist,* 1 (1890), 148-56.

[6] Read J. Robinson Stetson (ed.), *The Correspondence of Charles S. Peirce and the Open Court Publishing Company, 1890-1913* (Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2022).

[7] Paul Carus to Charles S. Peirce, July 16, 1894 in Open Court Letterpress Book, No. 2, 1894, MSS 027, Box 29, folder 123, p.386.

[8] Paul Carus to Francis C. Russell, May 10, 1896, in Open Court Letterpress Book, No. 7, 1896, MSS 027, Box 31, folder 123, p. 124.

[9] "Pleasure and Pain," *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 494; Paul Carus to Charles A. Dans, March 12, 1894 in Open Court Letterpress Book, 1894, MSS 027, Box 29, folder 2, p. 86; Paul Carus to Elizabeth Ney, May 11, 1897, in Open Court Letterpress Book, MSS 027, folder 9, p.313. Elizabeth Ney was president of the Texas Art Academy and repeatedly engaged by the State of Texas to model busts of Texas governors. She also had her bust of Schopenhauer photographed as a frontispiece for *The Open Court* in 1897; [Correspondence], The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 43, folder 3.2.

[10] Paul Carus to Edgar Ashcroft, April 11, 1906, The Open Court Letterpress Book, Coll. 27, Box 37, folder 10, pp. 917-19.

[11] See Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Records, MSS 027, Box 74, folders 4, 5, and 6.

[12] Paul Carus, "From Metaphysicism to Positivism," *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 695-96.

[13] Paul Carus, "Agnosticism in the Pulpit," *The Open Court,* 20 (1906), 414.

[14] Edward C. Hegeler, "What the Monistic Religion is to Me. A Letter to a Highly Esteemed New Contributor," *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 725-26.

[15] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Lutheran Church and Science," *The Open Court,* 3 (1889), 1811-12.

[16] Hermann Boppe, "A Criticism of the Works of 'The Open Court'" *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2066.

[17] Quoted in E.C. Hegeler, "Religion and Science," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2473.

[18] Hegeler, "Religion and Science," 2474.

[19] [E. C. Hegeler and Paul Carus], "The Religion of Science," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3511-12.

[20] "The Open Court," *The Open Court,* 6 (1892), 3102.

[21] Edward C. Hegeler, "Interview on the Nature and Uses of Money," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 74, folders 2-3.

[22] Edward C. Hegeler, "Free Trade or Protectionism," *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 1283-86.

[23] Edward C. Hegeler, "A Petition to the Congress of the United States of America," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 4935-36.

[24] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Dishonesty of the Coinage Law of 1878," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 5104.

[25] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Duty of the Hour," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 5103-04.

[26] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Election," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 5118.

[27] [Undated interview with Edward C. Hegeler] in the Open Court Publishing Co. Records, MSS 027, Series 2, Sub-Series 3, Box 74.

[28] F. W. Matthiessen, "A Tribute to Mr. E. C. Hegeler," *The Open Court,* 24 (1910), 445-46.

Chapter 5: Opinion Makers

[1] Read Kenneth Lyffogt, *Iowa's Forgotten General: Matthew Mark Trumbull and the Civil War* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2005); Ray Boston, "General Matthew Mark Trumbull; Respectable Radical," in http://savingcommunities.org/docs/trumbull.matthewmark/ (accessed June 14, 2022).

[2] [M. M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court*, 7 (1893), 3877.

[3] Thomas J. McCormack, "General Trumbull's Connexion with "The Open Court," *The Open Court*, 8 (1894), 4086.

[4] "Wheelbarrow," *The Open Court*, 2 (1888), ii.

[5] Wheelbarrow, "The Source of Poverty," *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 1219.

[6] Wheelbarrow, "Henry George and Land Taxation," *The Open Court,* 3 (1889), 1416.

[7] E. Koerner, "Strikes, Local and Sympathetic," *The Open Court,* 8 (1894), 4305.

[8] Paul Carus to Gustave Koerner, June 27, 1894 in Open Court Letterpress Book, MSS 027, Box 29, folder 123, p. 349.

[9] Charles K. Whipple, "When is Homicide Justifiable?" *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 1236-38.

[10] Cesare Lombroso, "Illustrative Studies in Criminal Anthropology," *The Monist,* 1 (1890), 336-43.

[11] "Paul Carus, "Aliens Wanted," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3760.

[12] See Paul Kahan, *The Homestead Strike: Labor, Violence, and American Industry* (NY: Taylor and Francis, 2014).

[13] "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3525.

[14] Edward C. Hegeler, "The Homestead Affair: A Criticism of the Remarks of General Trumbull, and a General Consideration of the Labor Problem," *The Open Court,* 6 (1892), 3351-55; "Homestead Affair," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 74, folder 5.

[15] [M. M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 8 (1894), 4046.

[16] Edward D. Cope, *The Origin of the Fittest: Essays on Evolution* (New York, 1887), 2.

[17] L. H. Bailey, "Neo-Lamarckism and Neo-Darwinism," *American Naturalist,* 28 (1894), 661-78.

[18] Edward D. Cope, "The Marriage Problem," *The Open Court,* 2 (1888), 1307-10; 1320-24; Edward D. Cope, "The Lynching at Paris, Texas," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3606.

[19] Persifor Frazer, "The Life and Letters of Edward Drinker Cope," *American Geologist,* 26 (1900), 93-94.

[20] Edward D. Cope, "The Developmental Significance of Human Physiognomy," *American Naturalist,* 17 (1883), 618.

[21] Edward D. Cope, "On the Hypothesis of Evolution," *Lippincott's Magazine,* 6 (1870), 40-41.

[22] Edward D. Cope, "Two Perils of the Indo-European," *The Open Court,* 3 (1890), 2052-53.

[23] Edward D. Cope, "The African in America," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2400.

[24] Edward D. Cope, "What is Republicanism?" *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 4899.

[25] John T. Morgan, "Shall Negro Minorities Rule?" *Forum,* 6 (1889), 586-99.

[26] Edward D. Cope, "The Return of the Negroes to Africa," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2110-11.

[27] E. E. Moise, "Miscegenation not a Danger in the South," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2086.

[28] Edward D. Cope, "The Return of the Negroes to Africa," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2331.

[29] H. F. Kletzing and W. H. Crogman, *Progress of a Race* (Atlanta, GA: J. L. Nichols and Co. 1898), 282-83.

[30] Paul Carus to J. Virginia Lewis, 1901, Open Court Letterpress Book, MSS 027, Box 25, folder 26, p. 435. Read John S. Haller, *Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority, 1859-1900* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971).

[31] [Paul Carus], "The Intrigues of an Inheritance Case," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, folder 1, p. 2

[32] Paul Carus to Felix Orman, June 17, 1911 in Open Court Letterpress Book, MSS 027, Box 31, folder 24.

[33] Quoted in Martin John Verhoven, "Americanising the Buddha: The World's Parliament of Religions, Paul Carus, and the Making of Modern Buddhism," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisc., 1997), 304.

Chapter 6: Parliament of Religions

[1] Paul Carus, "Superstition in Religion and Science," *The Open Court*, 2 (1888), 837.

[2] Paul Carus, "Christian and Buddhist Sentiments," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 4828.

[3] "Paul Carus, "Goethe a Buddhist," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 4837.

[4] J. G. R. Forlong, "Through What Historical Channels Did Buddhism Influence Early Christianity?" *The Open Court,* 1 (1887), 382; 416; 439.

[5] Hermann Oldenberg, "The Discovery of the Veda," *The Open Court,* 3 (1889), 1547-50.

[6] Hermann Oldenberg, "The History of the Vedic Epoch," *The Open Court,* 3 (1889), 1573-75.

[7] "The Philosophy of the Vedanta," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2131.

[8] Paul Carus, "Enter into Nirvana," *The Open Court,* 4 (1890), 2635-36.

[9] See Norman Bolotin and Christine Laing, *The World's Columbian Exposition: The Chicago World's Fair of 1893* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2002).

[10] [M. M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 8 (1894), 3949. See Ida B. Wells-Barnett, *The Reason why the Colored American is*

Not in the World's Columbian Exposition (Champaign, Il: University of Illinois Press, 1999).

[11] Rev. L. P. Mercer, *Review of the World's Religious Congresses of the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893* (Chicago: Rand, McNally and Co., 1893), 8.

[12] "Miscellaneous," *The Open Court,* 16 (1902), 44-45.

[13] Quoted in Gustave Carus, "The Religious Parliament Idea," *The Open Court,* 47 (1933), 346.

[14] "Letter of Bishop of Canterbury, April 26, 1893," in Jenkin Lloyd Jones (ed.), *A Chorus of Faith as Heard in the Parliament of Religions Held in Chicago, September 10-17, 1893* (Chicago: Unity Publishing Co., 1893), 320-21.

[15] Quoted in Barrows (ed.), *The World's Parliament of Religions,* I, 26.

[16] Allen Pringle, "The Great Parliament of Religions," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3864-65.

[17] [M.M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3693.

[18] "Addresses," in Barrows (ed.), *The World's Parliament of Religions,* I, 67-68, 74-75.

[19] Barrows (ed.), "Addresses," I, 80.

[20] Barrows (ed.), "Addresses," I, 93-94.

[21] Henry Drummond, *The Lowell Lectures on the Ascent of Man* (New York: James Pott and Co., 1899), 342-43.

[22] Kay Koppendrayer, "Hybrid Constructions: Swami Vivekananda's Presentation of Hinduism at the World's Parliament of Religion, 1893," in *Religious Studies and Theology,* 23 (2004), 19, 21.

[23] "Address," in John W. Hanson, *The World's Congress of Religions: The Addresses and Papers Delivered Before the Parliament* (Chicago: W.B. Conkey, 1894), 382.

[24] Quoted in Allen Pringle, "The Great Parliament of Religions," *The Open Court,* 3 (1893), 3855-56.

[25] John S. Haller, *Buddha's Midwife: Paul Carus and the Open Court Publishing Company* (Middleton, DE: Amazon Books, 2021), 74-83.

[26] Paul Carus, "The Philosophy of the Tool," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 375-41.

[27] Paul Carus, "Our Need of Philosophy," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893) 3783-86.

[28] Paul Carus, "Science a Religious Revelation," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3809-14.

[29] Emil G. Hirsch, "Elements of Universal Religion," in Barrows (ed.), *The World's Parliament of Religions,* II, 1304-08.

[30] C. C. Barrows, "Review and Summary," in Barrows (ed.), *The World's Parliament of Religions,* II, 1570-75.

[31] [M. M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3798.

[32] [M. M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 7 (1893), 3821.

[33] Quoted in Paul Carus, "Gen. Matthew Mark Trumbull, in Memoriam," *The Open Court,* 8 (1894), 4079-80.

[34] Quoted in [M. M. Trumbull], "Current Topics," *The Open Court,* 8 (1894), 3933.

[35] Protap Chunder Mozoomdar, *The Oriental Christ,* (Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1883), 24, 27, 46.

[36] Swami Vivekananda, *The Life of Swami Vivekananda* (3 vols.; Myavati, Almora: Published by the Swami Vivekananda, 1914), II, 314-15.

[37] Paul Carus to Dharmapala, April 17, 1896 in Open Court Letterpress Book, MSS 027, Box 32, folder 7, pp. 31-32.

[38] Shaku Soyen to Carus, December 16, 1893, in Open Court Publishing Co. Records, Series 1, Correspondence, Box 2, folder 6; Martin J. Verhoeven, "Americanizing the Buddha: Paul Carus and the Transformation of Asian Thought," in *The Faces of Buddhism in America* eds. Charles S. Prebish and Kenneth K. Tanaka (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), 207.

Chapter 7: Changing Climate

[1] Paul Carus, "Christian Critics of Buddha," *The Open Court,* 9 (1895), 4476-78; 4483-85.

[2] Paul Carus, "Immortality and the Buddhist Soul-Conception," *The Open Court,* 8 (1894), 4259-61.

[3] [Organizational Memberships], Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 280, folders 1-82.

[4] Carus to E.F.L. Gauss, Jan. 19, 1895 in Open Court Letterpress Book No. 4, 1895, Box 27, Folder 125, p. 61.

[5] Suzuki note in file dated June 1952 on the eve of his departing for Japan, The Open Court Publishing Co. Records, Box 47, folder 44.1.

[6] Shaku Soyen to Carus, Mach 25, 1894 in Open Court Publishing Co. Records, Series 1, Correspondence, Box 2, folder 7; Shake Soyen to Carus, May 17, 1894, in Open Court Publishing Co. Records, Series 1, Correspondence, Box 2, folder 8.

[7] Paul Carus to Shaku Soyen, May 9, 1894 in Open Court Letterpress Book, No. 2, 1894, Coll. 27/123, p. 227.

[8] Thomas A. Tweed, *The American Encounter with Buddhism, 1844-1912: Victorian Culture and the Limits of Dissent* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 65.

[9] Bonney to Carus, April 29, 1895, in Open Court Publishing Co. Records, Series 1, Correspondence, Box 2, folder 12.

[10] Paul Carus, "Names," *The Open Court,* 9 (1895), 4379-82.

[11] Paul Carus, "How Far Have We Strayed from Christianity," *The Open Court,* 19 (1905), 577-87.

[12] E. Washburn Hopkins, "Review," *New World,* 7 (1898), 571-73.

[13] Paul Carus, "Scholaromania," *The Open Court,* 9 (1895), 4435-37.

[14] Paul Carus, "Salutatory," *The Open Court,* 11 (1897), 1.

[15] Carus to Bonney, December 8, 1896, in The Open Court Publishing Co. Records, Box 281, folder 1.

[16] C. C. Bonney, "The Principles of the Open Court," *The Open Court,* 14 (1900), 1-3.

[17] Bonney, "The Principles of the Open Court," 1-3.

[18] Paul Carus, "Buddhism in Its Contrast with Christianity as Viewed by Sir Monier Monier-Williams," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 4783-89.

[19] Paul Carus, "The Buddhist Tract," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 5062.

[20] Paul Carus, "Buddhism and the Religion of Science," *The Open Court,* 10 (1896), 4845.

[21] "Miscellaneous," *The Open Court,* 17 (1903), 702-703.

[22] "Message of Buddhism to Christianity," 20 (1906), 758.

Chapter 8: The Company

[1] *Notebook of Minutes of Meetings of the Directors and Stockholders of the Open Court Publishing Company, 1884-1907*, Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, unprocessed.

[2] "Thomas J. McCormack, 1865-1932," *The Open Court,* 46 (1932), 729-31.

[3] D. T. Suzuki and Wayne S. Yokoyama," The Life of a Certain Person," *The Eastern Buddhist,* 36 (2007), 3-7.

[4] Paul Carus to D. T. Suzuki, September 13, 1897, in The Open Court Publishing Company Records, MSS 027, Series 1, Sub Series 5, Letterpress Book, Box 32, folder 18.

[5] [Miscellaneous letters], The Open Court Publishing Company Records, MSS 027, Box 47, folder 44.

[6] D. T. Suzuki to Paul Carus, June 3, 1908, The Open Court Publishing Company Records*,* Box 47, folder 44; E. C. Hegeler to Suzuki, December 18, 1908, The Open Court Publishing Company Records, MSS 027, Box 47, folder 44.

[7] [General Correspondence], Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Letterpress Book, MSS 027, Box 35, folders 31, 32; Box 26, folders 2, 8-11.

[8] [undated letter from Paul Carus to M. A. Sacksteder] Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Inheritance Case, MSS 133, Box 31, folder 24.

[9] [Correspondence], Open Court Letterpress Book November, 1902, MSS 027, Box 35, folder 66.

[10] Ernst Schultze, "Voices from German Freemasonry," *The Open Court,* 30 (1916), 705-14.

[11] "Correspondence," Edward Hegeler-Paul Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 24; Solon DeLeon and Irma C. Hayssen and Grace Poole (eds.), *The American Labor Who's Who* (New York: Hanford Press, 1925), 93.

[12] [Payroll], Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Financial Records, Box 417.

[13] See Rolland Ewell Stevens, "The Open Court Publishing Company, 1887-1919," (Master of Arts in Library Science: Champaign, Illinois, 1943), 48-49; Henderson, *Catalyst for Controversy,* 140-44; *N. W. Ayer and Son's Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals, 1887-1919* (NY: Funk and Wagnalls Co. 1887-1919); George P. Rowell's *American Newspaper Directory,*1898 (NY: George P. Rowell and Co., 1898).

[14] [Report of excessive inventory in London agent], Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, folder 24.

[15] "Book Reviews and Notes,' *The Open Court,* 11 (1897), 768; Stevens, "The Open Court Publishing Company, 1887-1919," 62-63.

[16] Stevens, "The Open Court Publishing Company, 1887-1919," 63-64; Catherine Cook, "Putting the Open Court Co. on the Bookseller's Map," *Publisher's Weekly,* 91 (1917), 1700.

[17] Stevens, "The Open Court Publishing Company, 1887-1919," 53-54.

[18] C. C. Bonney to E. C. Hegeler, "The Hegeler Institute," February 1, 1899, in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 22.

[19] C. C. Bonney to E. C. Hegeler, April 6, 1899, in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 133, Box 4, folder 22.

[20] Quoted in Martin John Verhoeven, "Americanising the Buddha: The World's Parliament of Religions, Paul Carus, and the Making of Modern Buddhism," 219-220.

[21] Catherine Cook, "Putting the Open Court Co. on the Bookseller's Map," *Publisher's Weekly,* 91 (1917), 1699.

Chapter 9: Requiem for a Leader

[1] Eight years later, when Frederick Matthiessen died from complications of a stroke at age 82 on February 18, 1918, the family kept his funeral entirely private. There was a service held in his home attended by his family, followed by the body being transported by rail to the Chicago Oakwood Cemetery for cremation and interment. In respect for his passing, the businesses in La Salle and Peru closed from 11 am to noon.

[2] [Quoted in newspaper clipping], in https://images.findagrave.com/photos/2008/220/28850488_121824185542.jpg (accessed August 20, 2022).

[3] Paul Carus, "In Memory of Mr. E. C. Hegeler," *The Open Court,* 24 (1910), 387-90.

[4] [Newspaper clipping], in https://images.findagrave.com/photos/2008/220/28850488_121824185542.jpg (accessed August 20, 2022).

[5] "Inheritance Case," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 1, folder 22.

[6] "Inheritance Case," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 1, folder 22.

[7] "Inheritance Case," The Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 1, folder 22.

[8] [Inheritance Correspondence], in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, [undated, untitled manuscript] MSS 133 Box 1, folder 22.

[9] Paul Carus, "To My Brothers-in-Law," *Book of Poems*, Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, Book of Poems, MSS 133, Box 1, folder 38.

[10] [Paul Carus], "Intrigues of the Inheritance Case," The Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, Folder 1.

[11] [Paul Carus], "Intrigues of the Inheritance Case," The Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, Folder 1.

[12] [Paul Carus], "Intrigues of the Inheritance Case," The Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, Folder 1.

[13] [Paul Carus], "Intrigues of the Inheritance Case," The Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, Folder 1.

[14] [Paul Carus], "Intrigues of the Inheritance Case," The Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, Folder 1.

[15] [Inheritance Correspondence], in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, [undated, untitled manuscript] MSS 133 Box 1, folder 22, p. 18.

[16] [Emil Storm's deposition], Open Court Publishing Co. Records, MSS 133, Box 1, folder 22; [Inheritance Correspondence], in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, [undated, untitled manuscript] MSS 133 Box 1, folder 22, pp. 30-43.

[17] [Inheritance Correspondence], in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, [undated, untitled manuscript] MSS 133 Box 1, folder 22.

[18] [Inheritance Correspondence], in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, [undated, untitled manuscript] MSS 133 Box 1, folder 22.

[19] [Inheritance Correspondence], in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers, [undated, untitled manuscript] MSS 133 Box 1, folder 22.

[20] "Seaman's Opinion," in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Family Papers [Inheritance Correspondence], MSS 133, Box 1, folder 22.

[21] [Paul Carus], "Intrigues of the Inheritance Case," The Hegeler/Carus Family Papers, MSS 133, Box 31, Folder 1.

[22] In the addendum to the narrative, Carus admitted to spending several nights at Catherine Cook's apartment.

Postscript

[1] Read John Michael Andrick, *The Psychical Science Congress and the Culture of Progressive Occultism in Fin-de-Siècle Chicago, 1885-1900* (Urbana-Champaign, Illinois: Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2016).

[2] George Lawton, "Spiritualism. A Contemporary American Religion," *Journal of Religion,* 10 (1930), 37-39, 41.

[3] Jennifer Bann, "Ghostly Hands and Ghostly Agency: The Changing Figure of the Nineteenth-Century Specter," *Victorian Studies,* 51 (2009), 663-85.

[4] Elliott Coues, "Psychical Science at the World's Fair in 1893," *The Nation,* 54 (1892), 282.

[5] [Pamphlets], Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, MSS 027, Box 281, folder 4.

[6] Sara A. Underwood, *Spirit Writing, with other Psychic Experiences* (Chicago: Thomas G. Newman, 1896), 39, 41.

[7] Underwood, *Spirit Writing,* 22.

[8] Underwood, *Spirit Writing,* 11, 16.

[9] Underwood, *Spirit Writing,* 54, 58.

[10] Underwood, *Spirit Writing,* 15, 20.

[11] Paul Carus to William D'Hartburn Washington, September 13, 1894, in Open Court Publishing Co. Papers, Letterpress Book, MSS 027, Box 2, folder 124, p. 54.

[12] Paul Carus, "On Psychical Research," *The Open Court,* 33 (1919), 554.

[13] Paul Carus to Frederick Willpert, September 30, 1902, in Open Court Letterpress Book, MSS 27, Box 35, folder 63, p. 92

Bibliography

Books:

Abbott, David P. *Behind the Scenes with the Mediums*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1912.

_____. *The History of a Strange Case*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing. 1908.

_____. *Spirit Portrait Mystery; Its Final Solution*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing, 1913.

Andrick, John Michael. *The Psychical Science Congress and the Culture of Progressive Occultism in fin-de-siècle Chicago, 1885-1900*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign, 2016.

Barrows (ed.), John Henry. *The World's Parliament of Religions: An Illustrated and Popular Story of the World's First Parliament of Religions, Held in Chicago in Connection with the Columbian Exposition of 1893*. 2 vols.; Chicago, IL: Parliament Publishing Co., 1893.

_____. *Christianity the World-Religion*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co., 1897.

Carus, Paul. *Algenor, eine epische-lyrische Dichtung. Dresden: Grumbkow*, 1882.

_____. *Aus dem Exil.* Dresden: Grumbkow, 1884.

_____. *Fundamental Problems*. Chicago, II: Open Court Publishing Co., 1889.

_____. Gedichte. Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882.

_____. *God; An Enquiry into the Nature of Man's Highest Ideal and a Solution of the Problem from the Standpoint of Science.* Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Co., 1908.

_____. *Helgi und sigrum, ein epische Gedicht der nordischen Sage* Dresden: Grumbkow, 1880.
_____. *The Gospel of Buddha According to Old Records*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1894.
_____. *The Idea of God*. Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Co., 1896.
_____. *Kant and Spencer. A Study of the Fallacies of Agnosticism.* Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1904.
_____. *Ein Leben in Liedern, Gedichte Eines Heimathlosen.* Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882.
_____. *Lieder eines Buddhisten*. Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882.
_____. *Metaphysick in Wissenschaft, Ethik u. Religion*. Dresden: Grumbkow, 1881.
_____. *Monism and Meliorism, A Philosophical Essay on Causality and Ethics.* New York: The Cherouny Printing and Publishing Co., 1885.
_____. *Primer of Philosophy*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1893.
_____. *Ursache, Grund und Zweck*. Dresden: Grumbkow, 1882. Conzen, Michael P. et. al., *The Industrial Revolution in the Upper Illinois Valley*. Chicago: Committee on Geographical Studies, the University of Chicago, 1993.
Cope, Edward D. *The Origin of the Fittest: Essays on Evolution*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1887.
DeLeon, Solon, and Irma C. Hayssen, and Grace Poole (eds.). *The American Labor Who's Who*. New York: Hanford Press, 1925.
Drury, John. *Old Illinois Houses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977 [1948].
Drummond, Henry. *The Lowell Lectures on the Ascent of Man.* New York: James Pott and Co., 1899.
Fields, R. *How the Swans Came to the Lake: A Narrative History of Buddhism in America. Boulder*: Shambhala, 1981.
Grassmann, Hermann Gunther. *Die Lineale Ausdehnungslehre, ein neuer Zweig der Mathematik.* Leipzig: Vertag von Otto Wigand. 1844
_____. *Worterbuvch zum Rig-Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1873.

Guardiano, Nicholas L, and Pam Hackbart-Dean, and Aaron M. Lisec. *An Independence of Ideas and Thought: The Life of Mary Hegeler Carus*. Carbondale, IL: Special Collections Research Center, 2017.

Haller, John S. *Buddha's Midwife: Paul Carus and the Open Court Publishing Company.* Middleton, DE: Amazon Books, 2021.

_____. *Fictions of Certitude: Science, Faith, and the Search for Meaning, 1840-1920*. Tuscaloosa. The University of Alabama Press, 2020.

_____. *Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority, 1859-1900*. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Hanson (ed.), John W. *The World's Congress of Religions: The Addresses and Papers Delivered Before the Parliament*. Chicago, IL: W.B. Conkey, 1894.

Hegeler, Edward C. *A Scientific Basis for Ethics*. Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Co., 1943.

Henderson, Harold. *Catalyst for Controversy: Paul Carus of Open Court*. Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1993.

History of La Salle County, Illinois (2 vols.; Chicago: Inter-State Publishing Co., 1886).

Houghton, Walter R. *Neely's History of the Parliament of Religions and Religious Congresses at the World's Columbian Exposition*. Chicago: F. T. Neely, 1894.

Jones (ed.), Jenkin Lloyd. *A Chorus of Faith as Heard in the Parliament of Religions Held in Chicago, September 10-17, 1893*. Chicago: Unity Publishing Co., 1893.

Kahan, Paul. *The Homestead Strike: Labor, Violence, and American Industry.* NY: Taylor and Francis, 2014.

Kletzing, H. F., and W. H. Crogman. *Progress of a Race*. Atlanta, GA: J. L. Nichols and Co., 1898.

Lyffogt, Kenneth. *Iowa's Forgotten General: Matthew Trumbull and the Civil War*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2005.

Mathiessen and Hegeler Zinc Company. 1858-1958, Our First Century of Service. La Salle, Il: The Company. 1958.

Mercer, Rev. L. P. *The New Jerusalem in the World's Religious Congresses of 1893*. Chicago: Western New-Church, 1894.

_____. *Review of the World's Religious Congresses of the World's Congress Auxiliary of the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893*. Chicago, IL: Rand, McNally and Co., 1893.
Mozoomdar, Protap Chunder. *The Oriental Christ.* Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1883.
N.W. Ayer and Son's Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals. New York: Funk and Wagnalls,Co., 19887-1919.
Nash, Henry S. *The History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1901.
Open Court Publishing Co. *Twenty Years of the Open Court: An Index of Contributed and Editorial Articles*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1907.
Prebish, Charles S., and Kenneth K. Tanaka (eds.). *The Faces of Buddhism in America.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998.
Rowell, George P. *American Newspaper Directory, 1898*. New York: George P. Rowell and Co., 1898.
Stevens, R. E. *The Open Court Publishing Company, 1887-1919.* M. A. Thesis, University of Illinois, 1943.
Sugden, Sherwood J. B. *Open Court; A Centennial Bibliography, 1887-1987*. La Salle, Il.: Open Court Publishing Company, 1987.
Tweed, Thomas A. *The American encounter with Buddhism, 1844-1912.: Victorian Culture and the Limits of Dissent.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.
Underwood, Benjamin F. *Christianity and Materialism*. New York: D.M. Bennett, 1878.
_____. *Crimes and Cruelties of Christianity*. New York: D.M. Bennett, 1877.
_____. *Essays and Lectures*. New York: D.M. Bennett, 1870.
_____. *Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy*. New York: D. Appleton, 1891.
_____. *The Influence of Christianity on Civilization*. New York; The Truth Seeker Co., 1889.
_____. *Jesus Not a Perfect Character*. New York: D.M. Bennett, 1875.
_____. *Modern Scientific Materialism: Its Meaning and Tendency*. New York: D.M. Bennett, 1880.

_____. *Naturalism vs. Supernaturalism*. Seymour, Indiana: Times Steam Job Print, 1880.
_____. *Paine, the Religious and Political Reformer. An Address*. New York: The Truth Seeker 1885.
_____. *Progress of Evolutionary Thought.* Buffalo, NY: Green, 1893.
____. *What Liberalism Offers in the Place of Christianity*. New York: D.M. Bennett, 1870.
_____. *Woman: Her Past and Present, Her Rights and Wrongs. A Lecture Delivered in Denver, Colorado Under the Auspices of the Woman Suffrage Association*. New York: Truth Seeker Co., 1911.
Underwood, Benjamin and John Marples. *The Underwood-Marples Debate, Commencing July 20, 1875 and Continuing Four Evenings, Between B. F. Underwood and Rev. John Marples.* New York: D.M. Bennett, 1877.
Underwood, Sara A. *Spirit Writing, with Other Psychic Experiences.* Chicago: Thomas G. Newman, 1896.
Vivekananda, Swami. *The Life of Swami Vivekananda*. 3 vols.; Myavati, Almora: Published by the Swami Vivekananda, 1914.
Warren, S. *American Freethought, 1860-1914*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
Weisbach, Julius Ludwig. *Handbuch der Bergmaschinenmechanik.* 2 vols.; Leipzig: Weidmann, 1835.
Wells-Barnett, Ida B. *The Reason why the Colored American is Not in the World's Columbian Exposition*. Campaign, Il: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
_____. *Lehrbuch der Ingenieur-und Maschinen-Mechanik*. Braunchweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1851-60.
Zunc, Oliver. *Making America Corporate*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Articles:

Bishop, D. H., The Carus-James Controversy," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 35 (1974), 509-20.
Fader, Larry A., "Zen in the West: Historical and Philosophical Implications of the 1893 Chicago World's Parliament of Religions," *The Eastern Buddhist*, 15 (1982), 122-45.

Guardiano, Nicholas L., "Monism and Meliorism: The Philosophical Origins of the Open Court," *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy*, 9 (2017), https://journals.openedition.org/ejap/1072 (accessed December 30, 2021).
Hilton, Eric J., Joseph C. Mitchell, and David G. Smith, "Edward Drinker Cope (1840-1897): Naturalist, Namesake, Icon," *Copeia,* 2014 (2014), 747-61.
Holton, Gerald, "Ernst Mach and the Fortunes of Positivism in America," *Isis*, 83 (1992), 27-60.
Jackson, Carl T., "The Meeting of East and West: The Case of Paul Carus," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 29 (1968), 73-92.
Kitagawa, Joseph M., "Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki (1870-1966," *History of Religions*, 6 (1967), 265-69.
Leonard, W. E., "Paul Carus," *The Dial,* 66 (1919), 452-55.
Marr, David, "Signs of C. S. Peirce," *American Literary History*, 7 (1995), 681-99.
McMahan, David L. "Modernity and the Early Discourse of Scientific Buddhism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion,* 72 (2004), 897-933.
Myer, D. H., "Paul Carus and the Religion of Science," *American Quarterly*, 14 (1962), 597-607.
Myers, Constance, "Paul Carus and the Open Court: The History of a Journal," *Midcontinent American Studies Journal*, 5 (1964), 57-68.
Rampell, Palmer, "Laws that Refuse to be Stated: The Post-Sectarian Spiritualties of Emerson, Thoreau, and D. T. Suzuki," *The New England Quarterly*, 84 (2011), 621-54.
"Recent American and Foreign Patents," *Scientific American*, 29 (1873), 249.
"Recent American and Foreign Patents," *Scientific American*, 37 (1877), 233-35.
Smith, David Eugene, "Mary Hegeler Carus, 1861-1936," *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 44 (1937), 280-83.
Snodgrass, Judith M., "Japan's Contribution to Modern Global Buddhism: The World's Parliament of Religions Revisited," *The Eastern Buddhist* 43 (2012), 81-102.

Stunkard, Albert, "Suzuki Daisetz: An Appreciation," *The Eastern Buddhist*, 36 (2004), 192-228.
Suzuki, D. T., "The Life of a Certain Person," *The Eastern Buddhist*, 38 (2007), 3-7.

Journals/Newspapers:

American Geologist
American Naturalist
Dial (The)
Forum
Journal of Ideas
Journal of Religion
Lippincott's Magazine
Monist (The)
New York Times (The)
New World
Open Court (The)
Publisher's Weekly
Religious Studies and Theology

Internet Sites:

Borden Block—Chicagology https://chicagology.com/goldenage/goldenage144/ (accessed July 28, 2022).
Raymond Lohne, "Mary Hegeler Carus," https://www.immigrantentrepreneurship.org/entries/maryhegeler-carus/ (accessed July 28, 2022).
Ray Boston, "General Matthew Mark Trumbull; Respectable Radical," in http://savingcommunities.org/docs/trumbull.matthewmark/ (accessed June 14, 2022).
"Delegates of the Gods," in https://chicagoreader.com/news-politics/delegates-of-the-gods/ (accessed July 5, 2022).